



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2004

Strategies to address the effects of reduced funding for music education.

Jill Leigh Hobby
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hobby, Jill Leigh, "Strategies to address the effects of reduced funding for music education." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2252. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2252>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Strategies to Address the Effects of
Reduced Funding for Music Education

A dissertation
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Education in School Leadership

by
Jill Leigh Hobby
May 2004

Dr. Nancy Dishner, Chair
Dr. Benjamin Caton
Dr. Terry Tollefson
Dr. Russell West

Keywords: Music Education, Delphi Technique, Educational Funding

ABSTRACT

Strategies to Address the Effects of Reduced Funding for Music Education

by

Jill Leigh Hobby

The purpose of this study was to develop a consensus from a panel of experts composed of public school music teachers both based in instrumental methods and/or choral methods, higher education music professors from various backgrounds, public school administrators, philanthropists, authors, researchers, state music supervisors, and leaders in professional music organizations on regional and national levels.

Through the use of the panel of experts from geographical regions across the United States and Canada, this study strove to build strategies that addressed the effects of reducing funding for music education. The vehicle used to build consensus was the Delphi Technique. Through this Delphi study, the 35 panelists suggested, refined, and prioritized strategies that could address music education funding issues.

The Delphi panel members were asked to respond to 14 open-ended questions in the Round 1 questionnaire. During the Round 2 questionnaire, panelists were encouraged to make further recommendations or offer remarks to clarify the already presented strategies, which resulted in a final compilation of 12 questions with 67 subparts. The Round 3 questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section 1 asked panel members to rate the predetermined strategies on a Likert-type scale and Section 2 asked panel members to rank the same strategies in order of importance.

The consensus of strategies by the Delphi panel members may be used to address funding issues on local, state, and national levels. The strategies listed in this study agreed upon by the panel of experts could be transferred into a mass produced handout or pamphlet and distributed to governmental leaders, conference attendees, or published in music education textbooks to educate future music teachers on methods that can be used to combat ever pressing funding issues that continually threaten the elimination and/or reduction of educationally based and publicly supported music programs.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my mother and father, Sara and Harold Hobby. Without their love and support, this endeavor would not have been possible. Even though at times, they did not comprehend the tasks that I was facing with each stage of this long process, they offered constant encouragement. Throughout my whole life, they have sacrificed time, money, and energy to see that I had every opportunity in life. To be able to complete my degree is the fulfillment of a life-long goal. This educational achievement is a dream come true. This dream has become a reality in large part due to my parents serving as role models to me through their successful marriage of over four decades and their ownership of a successful business for nearly two decades. However, my dedication would not be complete unless I mentioned how strong my mom has been through her battle with esophageal cancer since her diagnosis on October 12, 2000. With each medical crisis since then, even with present medical battles, I have watched her rely on her faith to see her through each trial. Her faith and courage have lifted me up from some very stressful and uncertain times. On several occasions, mom and I discussed how important it would be for her to be able to live to see me complete this degree. I offer apologies to them for any extra stress that I may have placed upon their hearts in my quest to complete this degree. It is with my whole heart that I dedicate this dissertation and my Educational Doctorate to my mother and father. Thank you for providing the foundation to lead me to seek this higher degree and the support to lead me through this dissertation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Nancy Dishner, my committee chairperson. She has provided much needed wisdom woven with guidance and encouragement at times when I really needed to be led forward and lifted up at the same time.

I also wish to thank my committee members for their intuitive comments that have propelled my dissertation forward through their knowledge and wisdom. I would like to thank Dr. Benjamin Caton for agreeing to serve on my committee and representing the field of music by serving as a music scholar. I am indebted to Dr. Terrence Tollefson for teaching me how to write my prospectus through ELPA 7813. Finally, I would like to express heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Russell West for his willingness to serve on my committee as the research specialist and for teaching me how to use statistics to support research. Also very important to the research of this study are the 35 Delphi panel members, located all across the United States and even Canada, who graciously accepted the role and responsibility of completing three surveys and meeting the given deadlines without complaint. Without your comments and insight, this study would have never happened.

I would also like to thank Dr. Doug Cross for leading me to Dr. Gary Skolits. Both Dr. Skoltis and Dr. John McCook served as statistical research aides in the final days of data analysis on this dissertation. Both of you took time to help me determine the numerical conclusions in this study, but more importantly, both of you made sure that I understood the findings. Likewise, I would like to thank Dr. Judith Beaty. Thank you for taking an interest in me and my study.

A special note of thanks extends to my life-long friend and mentor Dr. June Gorski, who expressed early on in my life the importance of education and the right for women to want to achieve more, Dr. Thomas Milligan, who flamed my desire to become a more critical consumer of music, Dr. Mary Sue Kelly-Cagle, who told me that I had the skills necessary to complete a Doctorate in Education, and my friend Dr. Kara Stooksbury, who could relate to my frustrations and offer advice over lunches at McAllister's Deli.

A special thank you goes to my music students from both Vine Middle Performing Arts and Sciences Magnet School and Knoxville West High School for offering encouragement and support through my coursework and this dissertation. Two students in particular deserve special recognition. Daniel Potts, thank you for graciously reading out numbers as I completed the data files. Nina Myers, thank you for serving as my "research assistant" throughout the past three years. I will never forget our adventures in the U. T. Library, my first Statistics Assignment using SPSS, the days and nights of tallies that were eventually meaningless, and your excitement when I made progress. I look forward to the day when I am able to watch you participate in your own graduation exercises. I hope in some small way I have inspired you and the hundreds of other students I have taught over the past few years to search for knowledge, strive for excellence, and seek to be the very best in whatever you set out to do.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	9
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	11
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Research Questions.....	12
Background to the Study.....	12
Significance to the Study	13
Limitations and Delimitations	14
Assumptions	15
Overview of the Study	15
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	17
An Early History of the Development of Music	17
History of Music Education in the United States	21
Reasons of the Importance of Music Education.....	32
Effects of Music Education on Academic Performance	35
Effects of Music Education on Others	37
Effects of Reduced Funding on Music Programs.....	39
Strategies to Aid the Support of Music Education	44

Chapter	Page
Summary of the Literature Review.....	48
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	50
Research Design	51
Delphi Group Selection.....	56
Instrumentation	58
Summary	58
4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	60
Survey Distribution.....	60
Response Rate	61
Demographics of Panel.....	61
Methodology of Content Analysis: Round 1 Questionnaire.....	62
Round 1: Findings and Analysis.....	66
Summary	74
5. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	75
Survey Distribution.....	75
Response Rate	76
Methodology of Content Analysis: Round 2 Questionnaire.....	76
Summary	78
6. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	79
Construction of Round 3 Questionnaire	79
Round 3 Section 1: Findings and Analysis	81
Sound 3 Section 2: Findings and Analysis.....	123
Summary of Survey 3	148
7. INTREPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	149
Introduction and Review of the Study	149

Chapter	Page
Research Question 1 Conclusions	150
Research Question 2 Conclusions	153
Research Question 3 Conclusions	157
Recommendations for Future Research	161
Summary	164
REFERENCES.....	165
APPENDICES	172
Appendix A: Letter to Delphi Panel	172
Appendix B: Round One Instructions and Questionnaire	174
Appendix C: Round Two Instructions and Questionnaire	178
Appendix D: Round Three Instructions and Questionnaire	183
Appendix E: The Delphi Panel.....	198
Appendix F: List of Strategies	203
VITA	206

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Section 1, Establishing Partnerships with Local Businesses	84
2. Section 1, Building Awareness about Reduced Funding.....	87
3. Section 1, Building Community Support.....	90
4. Section 1, Increasing Parental Support	93
5. Section 1, Sharing Facts and Benefits with the Public	96
6. Section 1, Educating Building Level Administrators on Benefits	100
7. Section 1, Gaining Administrative Support	104
8. Section 1, Interdisciplinary Learning	107
9. Section 1, Gaining Support from other Teachers/Professors.....	112
10. Section 1, Gaining Successful Methods for Preparing Grants.....	115
11. Section 1, Increasing Awareness of the Benefits	118
12. Section 1, Impacted Curricular Decision-Making.....	122
13. Section 2, Establishing Partnerships with Local Businesses	124
14. Section 2, Building Awareness about Reduced Funding.....	126
15. Section 2, Building Community Support.....	128
16. Section 2, Increasing Parental Support	130
17. Section 2, Sharing Facts and Benefits with the Public	132
18. Section 2, Educating Building Level Administrators on Benefits	134
19. Section 2, Gaining Administrative Support	136
20. Section 2, Interdisciplinary Learning	138
21. Section 2, Gaining Support from other Teachers/Professors.....	141
22. Section 2, Gaining Successful Methods for Preparing Grants.....	143
23. Section 2, Increasing Awareness of the Benefits	145

Table	Page
24. Section 2, Impacted Curricular Decision-Making.....	147

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Jennifer is a sophomore in high school. As she looks over the course elective selection sheet for the following school year, she notices that there are no music electives to choose from. Having been extremely active in the music program at her school for the past two years, Jennifer ponders what she and others can do to help reinstate the music program at her school because she believes the positive benefits of the music program: using music to emphasize teamwork, to build leadership skills, to build peer relationships, to connect other core subject areas, and to provide an outlet for creative expression, are necessary in forming a core knowledge base.

Statement of the Problem

There are many children like Jennifer in schools today; children who are realizing that music programs are being eliminated in school systems all across America due to a lack of appropriate funding from the national, state, and local levels. These drastic educational changes are affecting the children's lives and the lives of their families, classmates, and the entire arts community, including: local theatre companies, symphonies and orchestras, and community music organizations. This study addressed the question, "How can schools, school systems, state and local agencies, and arts advocacy groups find the appropriate resources to adequately fund music education programs that have been eliminated or are facing extinction?"

The purpose of the study was to determine what strategies the educational community could use to address the effects of reduced funding for music education. A

panel of persons with expertise in public school music education, educational administration, higher education music education, and music researchers were surveyed. Using the Delphi Technique, a prioritized list of strategies were developed to aid districts in designing strategies to lessen the funding issues surrounding music education programs.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this research study:

Question 1. What strategies are effective when addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education on individual communities and local businesses?

Question 2. What strategies are effective when addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education within individual schools and with school personnel?

Question 3. What strategies are effective when addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education on local, state, and national levels?

Background to the Study

In 2002, I conducted a preliminary research study concerning the positive benefits of music education. Published in the March 2002 issue of *The Tennessee Musician* magazine, this preliminary study, entitled, *Arts + Education=Core Curriculum?*, focused on the importance of including music education as a part of the core curriculum. According to the earlier study in 2002, the main problem facing arts education being included as a part of the core curriculum dealt primarily with the issue of how to effectively quantify the impact that an arts education has on a child (Hobby, 2002). With all of the stress placed on highly statistical information due to increased educational

accountability, the study noted that no one had been able to come up with a mathematical formula or standardized test that could rate the positive effects of arts education because of all the variances in methodology and other variables in the complex equation. More specifically, the earlier study identified three main ways arts education programs, integrated with the rest of the core curriculum, enhanced children's education: increased understanding of different cultures and traditions, increased self-esteem through performance success, and increased standardized test scores through relating music to academics. Even though the earlier research study included numerous examples and compelling arguments as to why arts education programs should be considered as integral parts of the core curriculum, the fact remained that numerous programs would be cut out of school districts across America as budget costs were debated in the months before school started (Hobby, 2002). Unfortunately, the problem of validating the methodology used for music education has been a major concern of state and local political leaders, school principals, and educational researchers (Poirel, 1998). My new study will focus on strategies that may be used to lessen the negative effects of the lack of funding for music education programs, teachers, equipment, and facilities.

Significance to the Study

The problem of the lack of funding for music education is not unique to any school or area. Researchers all across America are documenting similar funding crises, not only with music education, but education in general. It has become apparent over the last two decades that educational programs are at the mercy of the economy (Mark & Gary, 1999). Due to increased accountability with school curricula, standards-based education reform is placing emphasis on students' meeting high performance standards

(Zenger & Zenger, 2002). In order to meet these high educational standards, educational economists and state legislatures have identified the benchmark of new school finance methods to be whether schools provide adequate per-pupil revenues for districts and schools while being able to employ educational strategies that direct the students towards those educational standards (Odden, 2001). Unfortunately, due to the new emphasis on meeting the high academic standards and the rise in the cost of living from higher taxes and inflation, many arts programs are threatened in terms of being reduced and sometimes completely eliminated from some schools. Some school districts use “too little money” as an excuse as to why an arts education is not a part of their core curriculum (Longley, 1999, p. 73). Results of opposing studies have shown that school administrators actually spend more money to replace music teachers because three arts education teachers equal at least four and sometimes more academic teachers, due to the fact that many arts education classes are larger in numbers than regular academic classes (Royer, 1987). The results of this study will be significant in that it will provide strategies that may be considered by school leaders to address the issue of providing music programs even with the occurrence of continuing budgetary restraints.

Limitations and Delimitations

The following limitations and delimitations were relevant to this study:

1. This study was delimited to the study of strategies that address the effect of lack of funding on music education programs.
2. The study was limited by the nature of the Delphi technique. Using this research technique, a group of participants reached consensus concerning

strategies. No attempt was made to determine the extent that these strategies have been successful in the educational community.

3. This study was limited by my bias towards music education, but to counteract this bias, I used a peer debriefer to monitor the research study to ensure that all sides of the issue were addressed.
4. Furthermore, the study was limited by the returned responses to the survey instruments constructed for the Delphi group and the depth of reflections those Delphi participants were willing to invest in the process.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered relevant to this study:

1. It is assumed that music education does affect the learning and lives of children and adults.
2. It is assumed that the members of the Delphi group represent persons with expertise in working in music education related fields or as educational administrators who oversee music education programs.

Overview of the Study

The study is organized following the sequence described here.

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem, significance of the study, limitations of the study, assumptions, and an overview of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of literature dealing with issues related to music education funding. These issues include the development of music from ancient civilizations to the present, the struggle to incorporate music education as a curricular subject, the effects of music

education on children, societies' reactions to multi-cultural music education, and the vision and challenges of future music education programs. Chapter 3 contains the description of the research methods and procedures, focusing on the Delphi technique. Chapter 4 includes the presentation and analysis of data of Round 1. Chapter 5 describes and analyzes Round 2. Chapter 6 identifies specific areas of consensus gained through the numerical data gathered in Round 3. Chapter 7 includes a summary of findings, conclusion, and recommendations for further research and to improve practice.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the literature and research related to the study. The review of the literature is focused on five major areas: (a) an early history of the development of music; (b) history of music education in the United States; (c) reasons of the importance of music education; (d) effects of music education on academic performance; (e) effects of music education on others, and (f) effects of reduced funding on music programs; (g) strategies to aid the support of music education.

An Early History of the Development of Music

The enjoyment and study of music has been around since the time of ancient Greeks and the existence of the Hebrew people (Tellstrom, 1971). In fact, music has long been used as a source of emotional restoration and mental relaxation, which is one reason why a child responds to his mother's song (Bunch, 1995). During the enslavement of the Hebrew people in Egypt, Moses demonstrated the importance of music through his musical compositions and teaching (Mark & Gary, 1999). Early on, music was deeply connected to religious ceremonies (Grout & Palisca, 1996). More specifically, music was used in the religious services as a means of offering songs of thanksgiving, praise, and supplication to God. As time evolved and society advanced, the Greeks at the Mediterranean basin were introduced to an organized musical system (Mark & Gary). One of the first music competitions ever held was in 586 B.C. at the Pythian games where the lyre, an early harp, and aulos, a reed instrument with twin pipes, were played as solo instruments (Grout & Palisca). Even the Greek mathematician, Pythagoras, who lived

between 582-507 B.C., incorporated arithmetic into musical concepts along with the physics of musical sound and mathematical proportions to build an integrated learning system (Mark & Gary). In fact, Pythagoras linked musical sounds of plucked strings to a numerical system, which led to the discovery of mathematical ratios to string lengths in order to produce certain sounds (Kerman, 1980). Pythagoras was widely recognized as the founder of Greek music theory (Grout & Palisca).

By the time of Plato (c. 427-347 B.C.), music education became a focus in Greek education (Mark & Gary, 1999). In his role as an Idealist philosopher, Plato's goal was to help others in their quest for truth. Music was an integral part of this search for knowledge because it served to inspire the soul. As culture and society evolved, the Roman people, who were most known for creating the legal system, also placed an emphasis on incorporating music in Roman life. Contrary to previous societies, Roman music was made by professional musicians, not nobility. Around 330 B.C., Aristotle shared his views of music as a tool "for amusement and intellectual enjoyment as well as for education" in the *Politics* (Grout & Palisca, 1996). Furthermore, through the A.D. 200 writings of Athenaeus, the importance of music education was identified through the description of how boys living in Arcadia were mandated by law to be trained in singing, so that they could sing songs to the gods (Mark & Gary). At this time, only vocal music was used in public religious services because people were able to sing about the Christian teachings they had heard and read about (Grout & Palisca). After the Edict of Milan (A.D. 313) legalized Christianity, St. Augustine stressed the importance of the aesthetic influence of music in relation to morality (Mark & Gary).

During the historical time period of the Middle Ages, which spanned 450 A.D. to 1400 A.D., musical notation became more refined due to the rise of Gregorian chant (Kerman, 1980). By 1000 A.D., music manuscripts displayed musical passages whose melodies were independent of each other, which were called polyphony (Kerman). This contrasted with the earlier musical texture, monophony, which was a single unaccompanied melody (Kerman). The major authority on music during the Middle Ages, Boethius, divided music into three kinds: *musica mundana* (cosmic music), *musica humana* (humanistic music), and *musica instrumentalis* (instrumental music), which inspired people to be critical listeners to music (Grout & Palisca, 1996). Boethius took the study of music even farther as he combined the study of musical theory with mathematical proportions and harmony (Mark & Gary, 1999). By the Middle Ages, singing schools, called *scholae cantorum*, were expanded “to include instruction in singing, playing instruments, and basic elements of harmony and composition” (Abeles, Hoffer, & Klotman, 1984, p. 6).

After Charlemagne’s Letter on the Necessity of Studies in 787, the importance of understanding music notation grew in intensity, which led to the development of an exact musical notation and the musical scale through the works of Odo of Cluny and Guido d’Arezzo (Mark & Gary, 1999). Odo was also known for coming up with the letters A to G to represent the melodic pitches of the scale, which were later incorporated into early sight singing techniques. An eleventh-century monk, d’Arezzo, identified a formulated pattern (ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la) to aid singers in the memorization process of the whole and half steps in the scale (Grout & Palisca, 1996). In 1025, Guido, also a theorist and teacher, published his theories in *Micrologus* (Kennedy, 1985, 304). Guido d’Arezzo’s

scale identification system is still being taught today with only minor revisions (Mark & Gary). Students of Guido developed a teaching aid entitled the “Guidonian hand”, whereby pointing to particular joints on the open left hand would stand “for one of the twenty notes of the system” (Grout & Palisca, p. 58). By the 600s, there was an expansion of medieval universities. Religious masses were sung every day to honor patron saints (Mark & Gary).

As demands for music increased, written manuscripts, completed on wood blocks, became widely sought after (Grout & Palisca, 1996). By 1501, the first music was printed on movable type by Ottaviano Petrucci in Venice (Grout & Palisca). During the Renaissance period, music had been taken out of most of the universities’ curricula. There was still music instruction, but these instructors were not regarded in as distinguished a manner as they once had been (Mark & Gary, 1999). As a result of Martin Luther’s Reformation, the role of education moved from the church to the state, which resulted in a decline in attendance because the governments were not equipped to sponsor adequate educational systems. As Luther continued to advocate for enriched curricula for all people, he focused on the importance of music education for young people (Mark & Gary). By the late 1500s, music conservatories were prevalent all across Italy. These conservatories taught vocal music and instrumental music instruction to the young girls, and the girls performed often in public concerts (Mark & Gary). Dance music also became popular during the Renaissance time period. Two dances that were developed during this time were the pavane and the galliard. The pavane was a solemn dance in duple meter, similar to an elegant processional, while the galliard was a livelier dance in triple meter (Kerman, 1980). The conservatory concept expanded to Paris and Stockholm

by the late 1600s. During this age of Enlightenment, social reform was promoted through humanitarian measures (Grout & Palisca). Even John Locke, a 1700s Realist philosopher who focused on self-reflection, supported the idea of music as a recreational activity. Unfortunately, the major unifying element of the development of musical study is the fact that music education was primarily reserved for the wealthy and titled people and those whose aim was to enter church work (Mark & Gary).

History of Music Education in the United States

Contrary to popular thought, music education in the Americas began almost 150 years before Columbus' exploration. America's eclectic musical heritage was first based on the "savage culture" of the Indians (Sunderman, 1971). Dating back to around the early 1300s, the Incas, in the area that is now Peru, taught music through rote, repetitious methods to the children of nobility (Mark & Gary, 1999). Franciscan Friars, who settled in what is now identified as Florida, taught music to Indians in the hope to spread the Christian message (Sunderman). The earliest Franciscan school, located at St. Augustine, dated back to 1603. By the mid 1600s, Spaniard Francisco Coronado occupied the land that eventually became New Mexico (Mark & Gary). It was reported that nearly 60,000 Indians were being educated through the infiltration of Franciscan education in New Mexico (Sunderman). By 1643, Algonquin Indians, located in what is now called Quebec, Canada, were being taught singing by Father Gabrielle Druillettes (Sunderman). The Native American Indians were known for their rich musical and historical traditions, which ultimately had a significant influence on the rhythmic developments in American music. Surprisingly enough, the first colonists did not try to meld together American

Indian music with British music because the native sound was so foreign to them. In result, this allowed American Indian music to develop within its own culture (Abeles et al., 1984). Spanish missions grew in size and later expanded to Texas, New Orleans, and California during the late 1700s where they served thousands of Indians by teaching music among other subjects (Mark & Gary).

Exclusively American music education began through the instruction given by the Pilgrims and the Puritans. Both the Pilgrims and the Puritans were followers of the religious teachings of John Calvin, who used the singing of psalms to express their religious devotion (Keene, 1982). The Pilgrims brought with them to America in 1620, the *Book of Psalms*, written by Reverend Henry Ainsworth in 1612. The songbook contained psalms that were written in English, Dutch, and French (Mark & Gary, 1999). The Book of Psalms, which contained 342 pages of octavo music, was also called the Ainsworth Psalter (Keene). By 1630, the Puritans arrived in America with nearly 1,000 men, women, and children. Six years after the Puritans arrived, they founded Harvard College. At Harvard, music was not a curricular offering, but students did learn to sing from notation (Mark & Gary). Because the Puritan leaders at Salem believed the Hebrew text had been taken out of context in places, they strove to make a more literal translation of the religious text by creating *The Bay Psalm Book* (Keene). Interestingly enough, *The Bay Psalm Book* was the first book printed in the English colonies, but “little singing occurred in the early colonial times, and...the congregation’s repertoire was limited to a few songs” (Abeles et al., 1984, p. 9). The ninth edition of the book, written in 1698, contained actual music notation to go along with the words (Birge, 1966).

Individuals in the northern colonies viewed education differently from individuals in the southern colonies. Public education was open to everyone in the New England Colonies, while in the south, school was reserved for the wealthy (Mark & Gary, 1999). In 1717, the first singing school opened in Boston, which ultimately led to the integration of music education in public schools (Abeles et al., 1984). By the 1700s, musical life in America began to flourish in Charleston, Williamsburg, and eventually in Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore (Mark & Gary).

In order to alleviate the problems of musical illiteracy, John Tufts, of Massachusetts, wrote the first American music textbook, in which he displayed a new system of reading both pitches and rhythms (Keene, 1982). His work also led to the singing school, which was important in shaping American music education (Mark & Gary, 1999). Tuft studied the earlier music notation that had originated in Europe, and created his own method of expanding rhythm, pitches, and sight singing. In fact, in his book, *An Introduction to the Singing of Psalm Tunes*, Tufts gave instructions in vocal training, scales, clefs, intervals, and meter signatures, which served to inspire other books published in the late 1700s (Mark & Gary).

Tufts and other ministers worked diligently to improve the quality of music in their churches by advocating for formal music education to be expanded to serve the masses (Mark & Gary, 1999). Through the use of the singing schools, teachers held classes in communities where people wanted to learn how to sing using actual notation. These singing schools met in homes, barns, and even at saloons, where the singers would sit in semi-circles around the singing master, who would teach them basic music theory notation, such as: clefs, keys, rhythm, and correct vowel pronunciation (Keene, 1982).

Once the people were able to understand basic elements of how to read music, they were able to fully participate in the worship services where new hymns were being introduced quickly because of the vast number of hymns written by Charles Wesley and Isaac Watts in the late 1700s (Mark & Gary).

William Billings, a Yankee composer, wrote music that had a folk sound. Billings, credited with popularizing American music, was most known for his tune “Chester”, which was played throughout the American Revolution (Abeles et al., 1984). Billings’ music was considered some of the first originally composed American patriotic music (Kennedy, 1985). He was also known for molding his singing school into a singing society, which later led to choral societies and musical associations. These societies were beneficial to communities because they generated interest in the public, which continued to flame the desire to keep music in the public schools (Mark & Gary, 1999). Finally, Billings was also known for being one of the first American composers to address the issue of the rules of composition and voice leading (Keene, 1982).

After the American Revolution the role of education began to change. Benjamin Franklin led a school movement that emphasized academies as private learning institutions. Of course by 1812 the people had little time to expend on schools and school curricula because they were consumed with the war efforts. By the mid 1800s Horace Mann, an American educational reformer from Massachusetts, supported music education as a public-school curricular subject in an 1844 document. Eventually, this document became regarded as one of the earliest music education advocacy documents (Mark & Gary, 1999). Mann’s influence on educational reform was far reaching, from

Massachusetts to the West, as he sought to improve instruction and teacher quality for children (Keene, 1982).

As Horace Mann was working for educational reform, there was another gentleman, named Lowell Mason, who was working for improved music education (Keene, 1982). Noted as the “father of singing among the children”, Lowell Mason was a key figure in making music instruction a public school subject (Mark & Gary, 1999). The Boston Academy of Music was established in 1832 by Mason and other Boston musicians. This academy was free and open to students and adults. It was recorded that over 1,500 students took part in the academy during its first year of existence (Mark & Gary). Mason’s academy allowed children “over the age of seven” to participate in the program for free if “he or she agreed to continue in the school for at least a year” (Keene, p. 111). In 1831, Charles Beecher presented a paper entitled, “Vocal Music as a Branch of Common School Education” at the Western Literary Institute and College of Professional Teachers annual meeting in Cincinnati. This paper proposed that: (a) all men can learn to sing; (b) vocal music is of physical, intellectual, and moral benefit as a school subject; and (c) to bring about the introduction of music in schools (Gary, 1964). Because of the success of the music programs by 1838, Mason was allowed to hire several music assistants, one of which was G. F. Root (Keene). Likewise, the Boston School Committee made a case for a vocal music teacher to be appointed to the Boston public schools in 1838. After its approval, this landmark action served as a vote of confidence in the musical possibilities for children and became known as the “Magna Charta of Music Education” (Birge, 1966, p. 286). Root, who worked hand-in-hand with Mason, laid the foundation for expanding the three-day singing conventions into a

thorough program that spanned a three-month period with extensive music training in the early 1850s (Keene). Finally, by the 19th century, music education programs were beginning to be validated through the leadership and writings of Mason and Root, and other lesser-known music educators (Mark, 2002).

It was during this explosion of music instruction, led primarily by Mason, that music conventions became an integral part to music teacher preparation (Mark & Gary, 1999). The conventions were training places for the leaders of the singing schools (Keene, 1982). These conventions eventually led to lyceums for adults to receive special musical training. In 1875, music instruction began at the Chautauqua Institute in western New York, which enhanced teacher preparation and specialized education (Mark & Gary). One year later, the Music Teachers National Association met to listen to papers and lay out the guidelines of the organization (Birge, 1966).

By the early 1900s the purpose of public school music programs was being defined by educational leaders. In 1905, A. E. Winship, editor of the *New England Journal of Education*, wrote an article entitled, *The Mission of Music in the Public Schools*, in which he noted that “school music must be devotional, patriotic, intellectual, and inspirational” (Winship, 1905/2002). Around the same time, Frances Elliott Clark, the first president of the Music Educators National Conference from 1907-1909, stated that “music...has much to offer in mental discipline...and next to reading, better stimulates the imagination” (Clark, 2002, pp. 100-101). During the early 1900s, there were new educational philosophies being introduced into society that focused on child-centered education, which was led by John Dewey. These new educational philosophies emphasized the child’s spirit, not the teaching method (Goodman, 1982). In a manual for

music teachers, *General Directions to Teachers*, written by Damrosch, Gartlan, and Gehrkens, music is indicated as being “one of the most valuable subjects in the school...because of its power to tone up the mind and body” (Damrosch et al., 1923/1982, p.177).

Throughout the 1930s, the subject of educational aims became a heavily discussed topic in relation to John Dewey’s ideas on progressive, child-centered education. During this time, musical aims were focused on fostering self-discipline, a fuller life, and a creative venue for learning (Mursell & Glenn, 1938/2002). In addition to the musical aims, was an effort to introduce rhythmic education into public schools through the European Dalcroze system (Keene, 1982). More specifically, the Dalcroze system included bodily activities that connected the brain and the body through the use of natural rhythms of movements, which allowed the body to become an instrument of art (Keene). Three other foreign music education experts, Carl Orff, Zoltan Kodaly, and Shinichi Suzuki, brought teaching methods to the states (Keene). Orff’s teaching methods embodied the act of experiencing through creativity; Kodaly’s teaching methods focused on the integration of rhythmic and melodic notation; and Suzuki’s teaching methods centered on rote instruction to improve the musical ear (Keene). With the explosion of new teaching methods available for music educators, teachers of music recognized the need for a professional organization whose primary focus would be to promote quality music instruction across the country (Keene). As a result of the Music Educators National Conference in 1946, nine resolutions were adopted and published in the first music teaching source book. The resolutions supported: 1. music in the elementary and junior high school grades, 2. state music supervision, 3. string instrument promotion, 4. music in

the senior high schools, 5. skill in reading music, 6. time allotment, 7. technological aids in music education, 8. music teaching as an exponent of democratic processes, and 9. the broadening scope of music experience (Music Educators National Conference, 1946/2002).

After W.W. II., the Korean War, and the rise of space exploration, Americans became increasingly concerned that more attention be placed on mathematics and science. In articles published in the *Music Educators Journal*, music teachers were asked to “note the growing importance in American society of science, which would take an ever-increasing role in the school curriculum” (Keene, 1982). In order to convince the public that music education was still important, music researchers, such as Allen Britton, creator of the *Journal of Research in Music Education* in 1953, stressed the importance linking the music, mind, and brain together to show valuable relationships (Mark, 2002). During this time of specific educational justification, “professional leaders began to discourage music educators from promoting the nonmusical benefits of music education...the value of music education was to be found in the music itself” (Mark, p. 141). This eventually led to the movement of aesthetic education. Aesthetics, a branch of philosophy, “gave music teachers reasons for teaching music but not necessarily reasons to change methods” (Keene, p. 359). Thus, as America’s schools became more culturally diverse through desegregation plans, music educators had to find ways to integrate the music curriculum that included music from other cultures, especially those that were directly linked to African-Americans, such as: jazz, blues, and spirituals.

With America’s numerous legislative acts that dealt with equality and issues of freedom and personal rights, it is not surprising that during the 1960s and 1970s

proponents of music education focused on the emotional values and cultural influence of music education. During the 1960s, with an emphasis on performing highly difficult modern compositions, it was hard to avoid the hazard of neglecting the less talented students, while concentrating on the gifted musicians (Rainbow, 1989). Even Gerard Knieter, while a professor of Music Education at Temple University in 1971, wrote about “the aesthetic experience involving the cultural matrix” and the “acculturation...process through which we acquire our social values” (Knieter, 1971, p. 178). During this time period, the issue of whether music education should be considered an art or a science began to infiltrate educational discussions, with most educational researchers concluding that music education is both an art and a science (Morgan & Burmeister). Hall, a researcher and author on musical sound and acoustics, stated, “I believe it is fair to say that scientific analysis can shed light on how or why certain esthetic feelings are stimulated” (Hall, 1991, p. 443). As more critical discussions were beginning to take place about music education, the field of music research began to grow rapidly, which led to the Journal of Research in Music Education and the Society for Research in Music Education, through the Music Educators National Conference (Lawler, 1960). With technological advancements and electronic music in schools, it was during the 1970s that copyright laws and music publishing became an issue of importance. The first copyright law was passed in 1976 (Mark & Gary, 1999). Music educators and music publishers were expected to follow that law in order to set the correct precedence for other teachers, students, and musicians.

Throughout the 1980s, people began to voice their concerns about America’s educational system. Numerous commissions, committees, and task forces were developed

to investigate ways to improve the schools. The most well known report from this time period was *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. This document, written by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, identified recurring problems with schools all across America (Mark & Gary, 1999). As the public became more and more aware of the country's educational deficiencies through reports by the media, some actions were taken by local, state, and national legislatures to correct the problems, but some of the educational weaknesses were too difficult to correct due to societal issues. At the conclusion of the 1980s, the term "core curriculum" had been used to identify the required courses that students needed, but music was not identified as being one of the core curriculum subjects (Mark & Gary). By the mid 1980s, Music Educators National Conference identified 3 *Goals for 1990*:

1. By 1990, every K-12 student shall have access to music instruction in school.
2. By 1990, every high school shall require at least 1 Carnegie unit of credit in the arts for graduation.
3. By 1990, every college and university shall require at least 1 Carnegie unit of arts credit for admission.

In the late 1980s, state supervisors began reporting increases in all of the previously stated goals (Steinel, 1988). For the first time in music education history, it seemed that music education had achieved a valuable place in the American educational system. The standards driven educational goals and objectives were indicating to experts in education that there was legitimacy and worth in music education for all students. As the push for national standards continued under the leadership of Ronald Reagan and

George Bush, “the country began redirecting attention toward objective societal goals” (Rideout, 2002, p. 36).

During the 1990s, as America’s melting-pot culture began to fade, a “salad-bowl” culture emerged in which different cultures and ethnic groups strove to keep their heritage and traditions in existence. Through this unsettling period of political correctness along cultural traditions, music education became a unifying force in honoring different students’ religious holidays through the medium of song. In a 1994 report on multi-culturalism, Patricia Shehan Campbell, a professor of music at the University of Washington, Seattle, wrote “Music teachers...have increasingly given their attention to matters of musical repertoire-authenticity, cultural representativeness, and the appropriate age...to present and/or perform” multi-cultural music (Campbell, 1994/2002, p. 226).

Of course education in the 1990s and beyond has experienced an increasing level of accountability through testing data and public perception. Resulting from President William Jefferson Clinton’s Goals 2000 Act of 1994, The National Standards of Music Education were aimed at providing a national educational framework that ensured equitable opportunities for all students. Once the National Standards of Music were in place as a guiding teaching curriculum for teachers across the nation, the issue of accountability, that once only concerned academic subject areas, soon embodied the field of music. As state law makers and local school board politicians eventually realized, there was a real dilemma to the issue of music evaluation. As Richard Colwell, a former professor of music at Boston University noted in 1990, “no teacher, student, parent, or policy maker recognizes...the contribution of a systematic programme of instruction...successful performances are attributed to charisma, personality, and

leadership qualities of the teacher” (Colwell, 1990/2002, p. 264). Simply put, “science...cannot provide the formula for developing man’s capacity to appreciate and to feel” (Tellstrom, 1971).

After the turn of the century into the year 2000, the Vision 2020 Symposium took place on the campus of Florida State University. This symposium devised *The Housewright Declaration* in order to create a clear, guiding vision for the next 20 years of music education (Vision 2020 Symposium, 2000/2002). Interestingly enough, many of the 12 guiding statements focused on preserving the integrity of music education for all people. This document did focus on the importance of recruiting prospective music teachers from diverse backgrounds through alternative licensing. That same year, the 106th Congress of the United States Resolved by the House of Representatives, with the Senate concurring, that

1. Music education enhances intellectual development and enriches the academic environment for children of all ages; and
2. Music educators greatly contribute to the artistic, intellectual, and social development of American children, and play a key role in helping children to succeed in school. (Hinckley, 1999/2002, p. 299).

The Importance of Music Education

Music education is a vital part of our heritage. Dating back before the birth of Christ, music and dance, two of the most prevalent art forms, were used as a means of offering praise and thanksgiving. As each civilization progressed into complex entities, other art forms became important parts of history, including murals and prose.

Consequently, in a recent music education publication, researchers claimed that music education should be integrated in the core curriculum because it teaches students about the world around them (Davenport, 1999). For example, students can explore foreign languages and authentic costuming through song (Davenport). The results of one study indicated that first graders who were taught rhythm and melodies of folk songs from different countries 40 minutes a day for seven months showed significantly higher reading scores than the control group (Dickinson, 1997). Music education can be a powerful tool in teaching sociological subjects because each civilization has memorable visual symbols, stirring songs, and eloquent poetry to instill national pride that can enlighten even young students (Warner, 1999). Finally, an integrated music education program is a vital part of our heritage because it is a vehicle to the past, as well as a time machine to life embracing different times and places.

The easiest method of measuring a student's success with a performing art is to look at his sense of pride and his level of self-esteem in relation to his desired art field. Sometimes a parent may use a variety of art forms to help a child become more creative or help build a child's sense of self-worth. Students engaged in music education must deal with issues of cooperation and teamwork when singing in a choir, dancing in a show choir, building a set for musical theatre, or when playing with a band. Recent studies show that music education offers excellent opportunities for helping children feel good about themselves (Warner, 1999). Corresponding information concludes that music and art classes are extremely effective with students who possess behavior problems (Dunn-Snow & D'Amelio, 2000). Listening to music with mixed rhythms from various countries can help enlighten a student on the passage of time beginning with the Renaissance

Period, passing through the Classical Period, and concluding with a study of 20th Century Music, which is the most recent genre of compositional style. Another rationale for music education is that music provides an outlet for self-expression and individual uniqueness because it enables students to express their deepest thoughts and feelings (Davies, 2000)

The idea of music having a direct impact on emotional responses has been around for many centuries. Each civilization, from ancient times to present, has used music as a means of unification of thoughts and ideas. In *Music in the Education of Children*, Bessie Swanson (1981) noted that music allows people from all cultures the opportunity to communicate and express ideas through their senses, intuition, and perceptions (Swanson, 1981). In more recent years, the field of music “has been used to heighten the senses and to restore health”, which has inspired music therapy degree programs in colleges and universities around the world (Bunch, 1995, 153).

As America’s focus on human rights and social accountability took center stage, the idea of aesthetic education began to gain momentum through the work of men like John Dewey (*Art as Experience*) and Irwin Edman (*Arts and the Man*). Both Dewey and Edman saw the quality of living being enhanced by arts education. Music began to be seen as a form of therapy and enrichment (Swanson, 1981). Music education began to be seen as a vehicle for arousing emotions (Sunderman, 1971). The fact that music can reflect multiple meanings to different individuals became a selling point of how music can heighten one’s sense of symbolism and imagination (Swanson).

Even though the early to mid 1900s saw emphasis placed on aesthetic educational experiences through music, by the time of the later half of the century, music had exploded into a media pop culture frenzy, which placed more emphasis on the medium of

the music than the music itself. Abraham Schwadron wrote about the misconceptions of aesthetics when he noted, “mass media, MTV, Muzak, and electronic technology...(are) concerned primarily with commercial rather than with aesthetic concerns.” (Schwadron, 1976). Furthermore, Schwadron went on to say that the entertainment industry has taken away from formal music education, which has clouded the existence of a true philosophy of music education (Schwadron). Because “all music is everywhere”, some people do not ever have the opportunity to listen to quality music, which ultimately creates problems when music educators struggle for credibility in the curriculum (Frith, 2003). Finally, aesthetically speaking, music education’s primary value is enhancing the sensitivity of people, even though it may lead to nonmusical outcomes (Labuta & Smith, 1997)

Effects of Music Education on Academic Performance

Since the mid 1950s, music education has been seen as an integral component of education, but it was not until the late 1970s and early 1980s that educational researchers began finding a link between musical study and academic achievement. In 1977, the American Council for Arts in Education published a report entitled *Coming to Our Senses* in which arts education was directly linked to achievement in other disciplines of learning (Swanson, 1981). More specifically, three principles were developed by the American Council for the Arts in Education (1977) that connected arts with achievement:

1. The fundamental goals of American education can be realized only when the arts become central to the individual’s learning experience.
2. Educators at all levels must adopt the arts as a basic component of the curriculum deserving parity with all other elements.

3. School programs in the arts should draw heavily upon all available resources in the community (Swanson, p. 1).

In a proactive argument regarding the positive effects of arts education, statistics are being used to demonstrate significant discrepancies on standardized test scores between those students who have studied music versus students with little or no musical training. The results of one study from 1987-1989 showed that musically trained students scored an average of 20-40 points higher on both verbal and math portions of SAT's than students who had not had arts education classes (Music Educators National Conference, 1991). Furthermore, students who took more than four years of music classes scored 34 points higher on verbal SAT's and 18 points higher on math SAT's than those who took music for less than one year. (Music Educators National Conference). In comparison, research done in 1995 showed that students who studied music appreciation scored 46 points higher on the math portion of the SAT and 39 points higher if they had music performance experiences (Harvey, 1997). Through more recent studies submitted from the 1999 College Board Reports, students who were "enrolled in music appreciation were higher than those of students participating in music performance" (Demorest & Morrison, 2000). Randall Royer, a middle school music teacher and researcher in Wyoming, reported various studies had shown how arts enriched curriculum could be a factor in raising IQ scores for elementary students. One researcher found that students who received school keyboard music lessons scored higher in mathematics and history than students with similar IQ scores. As a matter of fact, high school music students have been shown to hold higher grade point averages than non-music students in the same school (Royer, 1987).

Part of this surge of highly statistical information on the effects of art and music in academia is due to the recent Brain Research movement and the *Theory of Multiple Intelligences* by Howard Gardner (Jensen, 2000). Apparently, some researchers claim that musicians starting keyboard training before the age of seven have 12% thicker nerve fibers in the corpus callosum, which happens to be the part of the brain that carries signals between the two hemispheres (Harvey, 1997). Surprisingly enough, playing music in the ear opposite the hand completing the class work has been proven to help students learn faster than those working without the presence of music. In fact, dramatic music increases learning more than calm music (Davies, 2000). Finally, electroencephalogram results have shown that music alters brain waves, which can make the brain more receptive to learning (Davies).

Effects of Music Education on Others

New statistics show that music education cannot only help students achieve more in school but also in the workplace. For example, the interpersonal skills that are needed in choral groups and ensembles are precisely the skills needed in today's workplace. Likewise, employers are also looking for workers who have an individual sense of responsibility, which can be taught through self-discipline as well as self-esteem from being connected with an arts background (Volkman, 1999). Interestingly enough, many educational researchers believe that arts education can help prepare students for life by developing a sense of curiosity and an imagination that will help them seek out and reach goals (Longley, 1999).

Music education has long been associated with building communities through city-wide celebrations on national holidays and through free concerts to the public. Even former United States President Bill Clinton noted the need for rebuilding communities through arts centered programs. For centuries, music “provides the glue to bind us together” (Schmid, 1996, p.36).

Integrating music with other subject areas is another way to affect others through music education. Often times, connecting music to history, geography, and literature provides an educational link that inspires cognitive growth. In an article discussing interdisciplinary curricula, Robert Wiggins noted, “Integrated teaching gives students more opportunities to make connections that lead to deeper understanding” (Wiggins, 2001, p. 44). Of course, these connections can help students better understand different cultures. Multicultural music education is geared at attaching a “cultural meaning to the people...origin...or to the varied population of students within the classroom” (Campbell, 2002, p. 31). Studies are beginning to show that early childhood world music training can enhance motor skills and the ability “to unscramble the aural images of music...of their culture” (Levinowitz, 2001, p. 46). As America continues to become ethnically diverse, music can be the bonding element among people of different races and cultures.

One of the latest trends in studying the effect of music programs on people is through music therapy. A major reason this scientific study of music is becoming so popular is because of the rising number of special education students being mainstreamed into the regular classroom. As defined by the American Music Therapy Association, music therapy is “the prescribed use of music by a qualified person to effect positive

changes in the psychological, physical, cognitive, or social functioning of individuals with health or educational problems” (Patterson, 2003, p. 36). The ultimate goal of music therapy is to enhance the development of a disabled child through listening to music, moving to experience music, and playing instruments to feel music.

By far, the most important effect music can have on others is how it connects with people’s emotional responses. Paul Lehman, a former president of Music Educators National Conference, said: “Music exalts the human spirit.” (Lehman, 2002, p. 48). Through the subtle change of a key signature or tempo, music can evoke unending poignant moments of inspiration. Such moments of inspiration encourage students and adults to persevere (Taylor & Baker, 2003). Even though most researchers, teachers, and parents would agree that “the impact of music...upon children’s musical and emotional development” is significant, it is still “difficult to quantify” (Pitts, 2000, p. 215). The latest music research is beginning to show that “music is key to active, happy lives, and lifelong wellness” because humans’ attitudes positively change when they are doing something active (Schmid, 1996, p. 38). Music is a vital source of self-expression that human beings must have in order to exist.

Effects of Reduced Funding on Music Programs

Even though music education has been shown to have a significant impact on academic performance and on other people, whether through cultural awareness or people’s emotional responses, over the last ten years, schools have had to reduce funding for music and arts programs, which is in part a result of the funding shortage for general education. In the late 1990s, when the government “sliced the NEA’s budget by 40

percent, its education program was cut by a third”, which made some “worry that...music education could evolve into the domain of the rich” if students have to receive music instruction through private teachers that charge by the hour. (Boehlert, 1997).

As schools were expanding their curriculum after World War II, music education programs grew at a rapid rate, but over the last 10 years, “state and city budgets now give priority to citizen’s safety, prisons, and health care”, which has taken money away for general school funding resulting in the elimination of school music programs (Potter, 1997). This problem is not limited to small towns or school systems, but is happening in “big cities like Detroit, Philadelphia, and Milwaukee”, and to further illustrate this point, “in 1962...67 percent of schools offered string-instrument programs; today, just 14 percent do.” (Boehlert, 1997). Due to the back to the back-to-the-basics approach to education, school officials are now investing more resources on “reading, writing, and arithmetic, rather than music classes” (Fischer, 2002).

California is one state that has suffered enormous cuts in the arts, and “the number of music students has dropped from 124,000 to 64,000...(but) the economic crisis has often remained” after the budget cuts (Benham, 2002). In Tennessee, the entire education system is in a spiraling cycle of budget cuts and reduced spending. In 2001, more “specifically, cuts that impact state supported arts and arts education programs: eliminating the Tennessee Arts Academy (\$179,000), closing the Governor’s School for the Arts (\$400,000), and reducing staff activities from the budget of the Director of Arts Education” (Hinton, 2001). Madeline Bridges, former Tennessee Music Educators Association President, claims “...the events of the fall (September 11, 2001) can only deepen our state’s problems with supporting arts education and public education at all

levels” (Bridges, 2001, p. 6). Not only has music education been adversely affected by the events of 9-11-01, but also the school music industry felt the economic hit “from the downturn that occurred after September 11, 2001” (Ponick, 2002, p.21). Thus, it is not surprising that “we (America) spend less on the arts than any other democracy in the world under 5/100 of 1% of our national budget” (Norman, 1998). Unfortunately, as school systems work to create equitable funding, “...programs in music and the other arts are finding themselves battered by the forces of education reform and squeezed by the realities of fiscal constraint” (Laehman, 1993, p. 30). While most academic teachers teach between 20 and 30 students per class, most “schools on average have only one music teacher for every 500 children” (Hancock, 1996).

With the already impending teacher shortage in America, it is no doubt that music teachers are also hard to find. Part of the reason of a shortage of music educators is because high school and college students contemplating a career in music education see it as an unwise decision, due to the common trend of cut-backs, not only in school music programs, but also in general education. In Florida alone, the state’s “colleges turn out only about half of the teachers the state needs every year” (Kronholz, 2002). In an article printed in *Teaching Music*, six future music educators were interviewed in an open-discussion setting about what the future of music education will be in 2015, which resulted in the need for increased funding and increased advocacy for the profession (DeNicola, 2000). In a report entitled, *Influences on Collegiate Students’ Decision to Become a Music Educator*, collegiate music education majors were surveyed about the greatest influences on their choosing the field of music education as a career. The report resulted in the students citing “a deep devotion to music” and their former “high school

music teachers” as the most influential reasons for choosing a career in music education, but many of the respondents “indicate[d] negative anecdotal comments at the remunerative benefits of music teaching” (MENC: The National Association for Music Education, 2001).

The last decade, led primarily under President William Jefferson Clinton, has been very important to arts education due to The Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 and the 1994 National Standards for Arts Education. Unfortunately, despite the increased efforts to push the arts into a valuable place in education, there was hardly any quantifiable data that supported the cause of arts education. “By 1998, there were no national data sources that specifically addressed the condition of arts education in the nation’s public schools”, which prompted the Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1999-2000 report that was sponsored in part by the U. S. Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination, and the Office of Educational Research (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p.1). As a part of this statistical research report, principals were asked questions regarding both system-wide and outside funding for their respective arts programs.

“Unlike public elementary schools that had limited non-district funding of music programs (20 percent), nearly half of public secondary schools (47 percent) received non-district funding for their music programs. Schools with the highest minority enrollment were less likely to report this kind of funding than schools with the lowest minority enrollment” (National Center for Education Statistics, p. 45).

As indicated by the above statements, often times, the “choir director sometimes functions less as a classroom teacher and more as business manager” in order to

compensate for the meager budgets given by the school districts (Jorgenson & Pfeiler 1995). In the national report, *Gaining the Arts Advantage: Lessons from School Districts that Value Arts Education*, schools that are committed to quality arts education have “fundamental support...from the regular school district and school budget, but the strongest districts...enliven their programs with...supplemental funds” (President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and Arts Education Partnership, 1999).

Because states are cutting back funding, local tax payers are having to pick up the pieces with unending tax increases that create anger among some citizens (Bulkeley, 1991). This resentment towards increased taxes has become a critical part in political races on local, state, and national levels. All educators and educational leaders “face pressures from outside agencies that seem more interested in politics than in the welfare of children” (Webster, 1998, p. 2). Due to the issue of reduced funding, the resentment of increased taxes, and the threat of total elimination of music programs, music educators, concerned parents, and local businesses have to work together to find adequate funding for these programs. In fact, “70 percent of public-school music budgets come from outside fund-raisers, compared with less than 50 percent in 1977” (Boehlert, 1997). Interestingly enough, some school districts are not supporting the advocacy given by the music educators. For example, in 2001, Larry Michehl, a high school choral director, while accepting an award from his students during his choral concert, spoke out against the budget cuts that were being proposed for the next year, which resulted in the board “citing him for insubordination and lack of cooperation” (Gewertz, 2001). Unfortunately, “teachers who spot shortcomings in the quality of their schools are authorized...to shut

their mouths”, which does not allow for problem-solving to take place to eliminate or lessen the funding issues (Chase, 1997).

The reduction of funding for school music programs is also linked to the shortage of funds for the arts in general. Not only are schools facing funding problems, but even large symphonies are also facing budget deficits. For example, “the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra...canceled its national radio broadcasts...to combat a \$1.3 million budget deficit, while Houston’s symphony members were asked “to take a 13% pay cut”, which is recorded as being linked to “the falling stock market’s effect on donors and endowments” (Hughes, 2002). In order to continue to fund citywide arts organizations like symphony orchestras, opera companies, or theater groups, the public must be taught to appreciate these arts, which has traditionally been taught in public schools. School music programs are essential in the growth of other arts organizations because “education is the most important predictor of arts participation (Robinson, 1987).

Strategies to Aid the Support of Music Education

Funding is not just an issue for music education but also for public and private educational institutions at all levels beginning with K-12 institutions and continuing through the community college and university levels. Despite educational reform efforts to improve schools, music teachers and programs are in danger of additional cutbacks, and in some places “on the brink of extinction” (Gates, 1988). At the 1996 Music Educators National Conference held in Kansas City, Will Schmid, the Conference Keynote Speaker, said: “we [music educators] are poised on the edge of a knife blade always feeling the potential cut” (Schmid, 1996, p. 36).

Before the early 1970s, the primary source of funds for school systems were local dollars, which made up 60% of the support, while the state was only burdened with 40% of the cost (Cowden & Klotman, 1991). The battle of the rising cost of education continues to rage across state lines. Many states are looking for alternative funding sources to help supplement both vital educational programs and specialized programs. Some states continue to raise taxes, while other states look to lotteries to pump extra dollars into the economy.

Music education is usually one of the first programs to be cut when states fall into a funding crisis. Many music educators ascertain that legislators suggest cutting music programs to illicit an outcry from the most taxpaying people because music educators typically serve more students than academic teachers. Because of the reality that not all school systems' music programs are considered to be an essential component in students' educational experiences, music advocacy is a vital part of the fight for these special programs.

Most music advocacy comes from the parents and local community members that the music programs serve. These people take on the role of raising funds for equipment, music, costumes, performance trips, and sometimes even to supplement the salary of the local music educators. In the book, *The Arts Go To School*, Thomas Wolf's chapter on fundraising identified "two basic ways to get money for your program: earn it or raise it." (Hartnett, 1983, p. 114). Wolf went on to say that earning money includes charging admissions and selling organizational memberships, while raising money includes soliciting money from individuals, foundations, or businesses (Hartnett).

Of course, a new form of generating appropriate funding is through grant writing. Many federal grants are available today that link together after school programs with arts education. Furthermore, grants through private foundations are available to help with specific arts education needs, such as new instruments or funding a performance trip. In the book, *Administration and Supervision of Music*, grants are viewed as a way of moving music programs from average to excellent (Cowden & Klotman, 1991).

Because music education is expensive, it is vital to find people to work on the philanthropic aspect of the program. “Philanthropy comes from the Greek”, meaning “the love of mankind, charitable giving for a worthy cause, or a desire to help mankind through acts of charity” (Cowden & Klotman). Having recognizable members of the community on the side of advancing music education will help the visibility of the program and in result help raise money for the program.

As an example of the need for supplemental funding and philanthropic help, during the 1988-1989 school year, it was reported that secondary band directors raised 59% of their budgets. In the same study, 79% of the secondary band directors “reported having booster organizations” to help facilitate the fund-raising efforts, performance trip planning, and community outreach efforts (Cowden & Klotman, 1991).

Even though music educators usually do not see assessment as a positive aspect of music education, it can be used to gain support for music programs. Patricia Chiodo, an elementary music educator in New York, said: “support [from assessment] will not occur if we continue basing our grades on attendance, attitude, self-esteem, and how hard the student tried” (Chiodo, 2001). Most music educators understand that the future trend of

assessment will have to coincide with the local objectives, state goals, and national standards in order to generate support through legitimate assessment.

Despite all of the debate and advocacy in favor of the presence of music education, one question still remains: “Should music education be considered an integral part of the core curriculum of every child?” According to the Music Educators National Conference the answer is yes, every child deserves the opportunity to explore new places, to work cooperatively with others for a common goal, and to be motivated to reach within to fulfill personal objectives through the different mediums an integrated arts education has to offer (Combs, 2000). Unfortunately, despite the compelling arguments and staggering facts in favor of music education, there will be numerous programs cut out of school districts across America as budget costs are debated in the months before school starts. Nonetheless, the fact still remains that schools that incorporate the arts into the basic curriculum have measurable improvements in student success (Longley, 1999).

Many educators and administrators are beginning to realize that arts programs do not take away from basic subjects, but instead enhance the academic achievement of most students (Longley, 1999). The schools that are finding the highest rate of overall success realize that an integrated arts education can meld all aspects of education together, which in turn can produce highly intelligent, creative, critical thinkers, which will be the leaders of tomorrow (Longley). As for those schools that have not realized the importance of an arts education, advocates must continue to press on to ensure that someday every child has a chance to experience the benefits of an arts integrated curriculum (Hobby, 2002). Jeanne Rollins noted that schools and school systems must remember “there is a danger in relating funding as a condition for establishing national standards” (U. S. Department

of Education, 1994, p. 79). In conclusion, educational support in any discipline area should not be solely determined by a dollar value, and in order to ensure the advancement of music education, all stakeholders must “work together toward the goal...to high quality music education” (Combs, 2000).

Summary of the Literature Review

In order to give an overview of literature and research on music education, six major areas of relevant literature were studied: (a) an early history of the development of music, (b) history of music education in the United States, (c) reasons for the importance of music education, (d) effects of music education on academic performance, (e) effects of music education on others, and (f) strategies to aid the support of music education.

Research has shown a negative correlation between curriculum status, assessment issues, and inappropriate funding on music education. As shown in the literature review, over the last century, music education has advanced as a valuable subject area through the implementation of National Standards of Music. These standards forced state boards of education to create curriculum guides, which ultimately led to local school systems creating student centered goals and objectives.

Once the National Standards, curriculum guides, goals, and objectives were put in place, the difficult issue of music education accountability surfaced. Because of the lack of quantifiable measuring instruments for these curriculum benchmarks, assessment, by many music educators, was seen as an impossible task. Fortunately, assessment rubrics seemed to clear up the confusion among music educators when measuring students’ growth in both rehearsals and performances.

The only issue that still remains as a perpetual problem is that of inappropriate funding for music education teachers and programs. Many civic groups, businesses, and foundations are offering financial support through one time gifts, grants, and donations in order to ensure that music programs will still be available for years to come. Additional strategies are suggested in the literature to help aid the support of music education programs.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to determine strategies to address the effects of reduced funding on music education. A panel of persons with expertise in working with or studying music education or school finance issues was sent surveys. Through the use of the Delphi technique, a list of strategies was developed to aid in coping with and combating the effects of reduced funding for music education.

In recent years, results of educational research have shown a relationship between music education and academic achievement, especially in math and reading. Students who have had music education classes tend to score higher on achievement tests. Most researchers and school officials would agree that music education not only affects students, but also it affects communities and schools.

Due to higher tax costs, reports indicate that music education will become increasingly difficult to fund. Even though music education may not be the direct cause of academic achievement on students, it is hard not to link these cognitive connections with each other. Schools will need to seek alternative funding sources to ensure students, parents, and community members that music education still has a place in the education system. Different strategies are suggested in the literature to aid the support of music education.

Chapter 3 contains a brief review of literature concerning the Delphi technique including the creation of the technique, its components, and the appropriateness for use in this study. The Delphi panel selection process is also discussed in this chapter.

Appendix A lists the Delphi panel members, Appendix B displays the first questionnaire, and Appendix E displays the list of Delphi panel members.

Research Design

The Delphi technique uses a selected expert panel to examine a particular topic. Panel members are connected to one another through written communication only. Confidentiality is protected throughout the research study because there are no face-to-face meetings or telecommunication conferences. Basically, the complete Delphi process consists of administering a series of questionnaires, also known as iterations.

During the first survey, participants are asked to answer broad questions that relate to the research topic. Each questionnaire that follows is based upon the original answers from the first questionnaire. Hence, it is extremely important to make sure that each panel member gives as many strategies as possible in round one. Once all of the surveys are returned, a complete summary of answers is sent to each panel member for reflection and consideration. After knowing what the general group responses were, the experts are given another opportunity to respond again to the questions. In order to achieve research saturation, consensus must be reached among the participants or concluded when the experts have reached the point where little progress toward consensus is being made (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975).

The Delphi technique was developed in 1953 by Helmer and Dalkey at the RAND Corporation. The technique was named after the Greek oracle at Delphi, who the Greeks visited for futuristic forecasting. The Delphi technique is considered to be a qualitative research method. Two of the benefits to the Delphi technique are that it combines structured study with indirect interactions. By gathering and combining expert opinions

to achieve consensus about the future direction of a certain field, the Delphi technique is considered to be the best enlightening research instrument in existence (Heath, Neimeyer, & Pedersen, 1988). Interestingly enough, some of the early Delphi studies were used in conjunction with military intelligence agencies after World War II between the United States and the former Soviet Union (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

Delphi studies had roots in overcoming humanistic judgments for the sake of planning purposes. In 1936, Douglas MacGregor's study on the effectiveness of group predictions rather than individual predictions resulted in a term commonly known as the "MacGregor effect" (Lang, 2000). It has long been known that face-to-face meetings create several problems in research studies, including: dominating conversation by individuals or small groups, spending too much time on one idea, pressuring participants to conform, and adding more information than necessary to the meetings (Thomas, 2001). Because of the benefits of Delphi studies, it has been applied to other areas of study, including: agriculture, education, business, communications, health care, and technology (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

The importance of Delphi studies surged again in the last two decades of the 20th Century because researchers in all fields were looking to find effective research methods. Lang (2000) noted that the Delphi technique is a process designed to minimize the adverse qualities of group interactions while promoting the best use of group opinion. Clayton (1997) wrote that the Delphi technique offers decision-makers a user-friendly, rigorous, and systematic strategy in the collection and dissemination of useful data.

For the sake of study, the Delphi has four basic components: structured questioning, iteration, controlled feedback, and complete anonymity of responses.

Through the use of questionnaires, structured questioning is achieved. Furthermore, the questionnaires keep a clear and concise focus at the center of each study. All of the questionnaires are rooted upon the statements from the previous surveys. Each expert panel member receives the responses from the entire Delphi panel, therefore, all of the panel members can see the entire list of responses in order to make any revisions or reconsiderations (Thomas, 2001).

Seven criteria were developed by Linstone and Turoff (1975) to determine the appropriateness of using the Delphi technique:

1. When the problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques, but can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis.
2. When the individuals needed to contribute to the examination represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.
3. When more individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.
4. When time and cost make group meetings infeasible.
5. When disagreements are so severe or politically unpleasant that the communication process must be refereed and confidentiality assured.
6. When the heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results and to avoid domination by the strength of certain personalities.
7. When a supplemental group communication process can help the efficiency of face-to-face meetings.

This research study, which focused on the identifying strategies to compensate for reduced funding in music education, met the majority of these criteria, except for item number 5 regarding severe disagreement, which was not an issue with this study. Because all of the other criteria were met, the Delphi technique was selected as the research method for this study.

Once the decision has been made as to whether or not a Delphi technique is the appropriate method for a research study, Delbecq et al. (1975) suggests three elements are necessary in order to conduct a successful Delphi study:

1. Participants must set aside adequate time for the study.
2. Participants must be skilled in written communication.
3. Participants must be highly motivated.

Likewise, the Delphi study should not be used when participants have limited reading skills or when fewer than 45 days are available for the study. The quality of the responses is naturally linked to the participants' comments, commitment, and interest. Self-motivation is an important factor for the Delphi panel members, because no one from the study will be present to stimulate the participants into being intrinsically motivated (Thomas, 2001).

There is another side to the use of the Delphi technique. Some researchers criticize Delphi studies because of the difficulty in evaluating the reliability and accuracy of the results (Thomas, 2001). Because the technique is based on the compilation of opinions of panel members and the findings are situation specific, some more statistically minded researchers have contended that the results of Delphi studies were inaccurate. Lang (2002) noted the difficulty in comparing and measuring Delphi studies lies in the

application of case specific research methodology. It is important to note that a random sample of the population would not be worthwhile in a study, such as this one on reduced funding for music education, because the general population would not have the specific knowledge base needed for this study.

Linstone and Turoff (1975) listed other criticisms of Delphi studies:

1. If certain questions or items are not mentioned at the beginning of the study, they cannot be added later. Additional topics cannot be added once the study is underway.
2. In the process of reaching a consensus, extreme points of view may be suppressed, which might be beneficial in bringing forward new insights or information.
3. The flexibility of the technique means that it can be adapted to a whole range of situations, which can make it vulnerable to misrepresentation.
4. The bias of the monitor's views and preconceptions of the problem on the panel is considered a weakness and limiting factor.

Of course, the Delphi technique, as do other research methods, does have limitations and problems. Many of the weaknesses listed above could be linked to other well-known research techniques. The topic of music education has been studied all around the world. For the sake of this research study, it would be virtually impossible to bring all of the music education experts together to discuss the effects of reduced funding on music education. Without a doubt, if all of the music education experts gathered together, some of the more persuasive experts would further their opinions without allowing others to even speak on the topic. Through the use of a controlled Delphi

technique, the panel of experts can converse on the topic of music education funding without missing time off from work or paying for expensive travel arrangements. Each Delphi panel member will be free to openly express his or her opinion without being pressured by other experts (Thomas, 2001). Finally, it is for the above reasons that the Delphi technique was selected as a method of fostering collaboration on identifying strategies that address the effect of reduced funding on music education.

Delphi Group Selection

The most significant decision regarding the Delphi panel group is choosing who is going to participate in the study (Lang, 2000). In order to give credibility to the study, care must be taken when selecting panel members, who should have expertise in the related field. Likewise, the quality of the responses is directly related to the panel of research experts (Heath, Neimeyer, & Pedersen, 1988). More specifically, four attributes essential to the effective participation in a Delphi study were noted by Delbecq et al. (1975). Participants should:

1. Have expert knowledge of the problem.
2. Be willing to take the time needed for the Delphi process.
3. Feel personally involved in the problem.
4. Feel that the information garnered from the panel will be of value to them and to others.

From the initial contact with the panel members, the importance of the study must be conveyed in order to inspire participation. Also, the panel members should be made aware of their vital impact on this study. Of course, the researcher must take time to fully

explain through objectives, the nature of the panel, the obligations of the participants, the amount of time involved, and the information that will be shared among participants (Delbecq et al., 1975).

Depending on the research problem, the expert panel may need to be small or quite expansive. In order to represent an accurate cross-section of knowledgeable participants, the researcher must begin with a sufficient number of experts. As with any research study, no exact formula exists (Delbecq et al., 1975). According to Linstone and Turoff (1975), when constructing a Delphi panel, three important factors need to be taken into consideration: (a) it must represent a true group of experts; (b) the group must be large enough to represent an ample quantity of opinion; and (c) the backgrounds and experiences of the group should be vast in order to create a diverse group of opinions.

Early on in my research process, I began to brainstorm about music education experts in both public and private schools, colleges and universities, current authors, and professional music organizational leaders whom I have met over the years through conferences, workshops, performances, and through other colleagues. For several months, I kept a running list of those people whom I considered to be not only experts in the field of music education but also willing to take time to participate in this study because of a personal involvement with the subject.

Once my preliminary list of Delphi panel members was complete with people of different genders, experiences, and cultural backgrounds, I contacted them to discuss my research study and to ask them to serve on the panel. Furthermore, I asked each panel member to suggest other music education experts who might also be interested in serving

on the panel. Teachers, professors, authors, researchers, and administrators from schools across the United States were considered for positions on this panel.

Instrumentation

In order to give each Delphi panel member an overview of the study, each member was contacted through e-mail. A letter informing them in more detail of the rationale and timeframe of the study was sent to them as a follow-up measure after the initial conversation. Each panel member had to review the attached Informed Consent Document (ICD) that enabled each expert to be an official Delphi panel member for this research study based on the Institutional Review Board rules and regulations. The panel members were informed that the first questionnaire would be extremely open ended to allow for total flexibility in suggesting as many strategies as possible. Because of the confidentiality of the study, none of the Delphi panel members knew who was sending what strategy, which allowed for freedom through honest responses. Each panel member was reminded that, once the responses are compiled, he/she will be asked to refine the strategies during the second iteration. Furthermore, panel members were reminded to ask if any strategy needed clarification. By the third round of questioning, the panel was asked to rank the strategies according to effectiveness. Finally, a quantitative selection scale, commonly known as a Likert-type scale, was used to rank the strategies.

Summary

Chapter 3 described the Delphi technique and how it was used in determining strategies to address the effects of reduced funding on music education at the local, state,

and national levels. This section also contained the process and rationale behind selecting the Delphi panel members.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter contains a synopsis of the procedures and results of the first Round. Likewise, the findings of the first Round surveys are reported in this chapter. In this study I attempt to develop appropriate procedures for determining strategies that address the effects of reduced funding for music education. The findings and analysis of Round 1 are outlined in this chapter through the use of five major categories: the survey distribution method, the response rate, the demographics of the Delphi panel, methodology of content analysis and initial findings, and a brief chapter summary.

Survey Distribution

After careful consideration and research, the selection of the Delphi panel was finalized in January 2004. Members of the panel were contacted with an introductory e-mail that gave background information on the principal investigator and on the topic of music education funding. Attached to this introductory e-mail was the Informed Consent Document (ICD). Potential panel members were encouraged to carefully examine the ICD, which discussed the purpose, proposed duration of the study, procedures, possible risks and benefits, and contact information of the principal investigator and other East Tennessee State University personnel, who could answer questions on the study. The confidentiality agreement was also included in the ICD to ensure potential panel members that the information retrieved through the surveys would be held in strict confidentiality, as outlined through the Institutional Review Board policies and procedures. Potential panel members, who voluntarily agreed to take part in the survey,

were asked to send an e-mail to the principal investigator indicating compliance to the parameters of the study as outlined in the ICD. The deadline for returning the consenting e-mail was January 16, 2004. Due to the e-mail nature of this study, I received a waiver from ETSU's Institutional Review Board (IRB) granting that Delphi participants in this study would not need to sign and return the ICD, but merely send an email that stated agreement to participate in the study as an expert Delphi panel member. These materials are included in Appendix B.

Response Rate

By January 16, 2004, 24 of the 35 questionnaires were completed and returned. Four more e-mails were returned by this date but would not open properly due to variations in software. Contact was made with these four panel members to ask them to send the information as a regular e-mail reply. E-mails were sent to the remaining panel members to remind them of the importance of quickly returning the first round survey. The e-mails stimulated the return of the first iteration. By January 26, a total of 35 questionnaires were returned, a 100% response rate.

Demographics of Panel

The 35 panelists possessed 976 cumulative years of experience. Thirty of the panelists were public school educators. Fifteen of the panel members spent part of their career in administration. Twelve of the panelists had experience in grant writing and philanthropic efforts. Twelve of the panelists were higher education professors. Nineteen of the panel members had full or dual training in a vocal background. Twenty-three of the

panel members had full or dual training in an instrumental background. Twenty-one of the panelists considered themselves as researchers and/or authors with publications in state or national music journals. Thirty-three of the panel members have held state or national music educator leadership positions. Although gender was not an issue for inclusion in the Delphi panel, 20 of the panel members were female and 16 were male. The females on the panel had an average of 27 years of experience and the male panelists also had an average of 27 years of experience. It was an aim to keep the Delphi Panel group around 30 members because “few new ideas are generated within a homogeneous group once the size exceeds thirty well-chosen participants” (Delbecq et al., 1975). A complete listing of the Delphi Panel members is included in Appendix E.

Methodology of Content Analysis: Round 1 Questionnaire

Round 1 required the participants to provide brief biographical information and to narrative responses to the 14 open-ended questions listed below:

Please complete these brief biographical questions:

Name:

Current Position:

College/University:

School and School System:

Instrumental or Vocal Music Background:

Profession:

Years of Professional Experience:

Past or Present Leadership Positions in Music Education Organizations:

Mailing Address:

1. Please list strategies that have been effective for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs. (Please be complete in your answers and feel free to use as much space as needed.)
2. Please list strategies that have been effective for building awareness about reduced funding for music education. How have people in your area been informed about the reduction in funds for music education?
3. Please list strategies that have been effective for building community support for music education funding.
4. Please list strategies that increase parental support in local music education programs.
5. Please list any ideas on how to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support.
6. Please list ways of educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education.
7. Please list ways of gaining administrative support for music education.
8. Please list ways of inter-disciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school.
9. Please list ways of gaining support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas.

10. Please list successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.
11. Please list obtainable grant sources that support music in your area.
 - a. Local
 - b. State
 - c. Federal
 - d. Private Organizations
12. Please list strategies that increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards.
13. Please list ways that reduced funding for music education has impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution.
14. Please list any other strategy that I may have missed that would aid the support of music education.

The panel members indicated that they found the questions to be complete and worthwhile. Several panel members indicated they spent 45 minutes completing the first iteration. It is important to note that there were no substantial comments in regards to Question 14; therefore, this question will not be discussed further. Question 14 has been deleted from further consideration.

Before analyzing the data, I initially read all of the questionnaires without any content analysis. Interestingly enough, I easily found commonalities between answers. When content analysis did begin, only one question at a time was considered. In a logbook, I wrote down each question at the top of each page and then wrote down corresponding answers that matched the questions. Each time an answer

was repeated or similar in nature, I created a tabulation mark at the left side of the answer. This data organization process was repeated until all 14 questions had been analyzed.

After looking at the tabulation marks, I was able to group responses made by the panelists into categories for each question. If responses were given by fewer than four panel members, I defined them as outliers. Items that received four or more responses were considered for the second Round questionnaire. Obviously, the questions that received the highest number of responses indicated consensus on the topic and served as a basis for forming the second Round questionnaire.

As expected with the highly professional group of Delphi participants in this study, all of the responses were complete, which indicated that the survey panelists had put much thought into their answers and comments. Some surveys were completed with greater detail than others. Although all of the surveys were complete, some panelists typed up to six pages of answers for the 14 questions while others shared concise answers. Therefore, the responses did vary in the amount of detail displayed in the first Round answers. It is important to note that due to the wide range of professions of the panel members, public education teachers, higher education teachers, administrators, supervisors, state managers, philanthropists, authors, funding experts, and researchers, that not all questions could be answered by all panel members, due to the nature of the questions. When the panelists did not have the first hand information to complete the question, many indicated this on the survey with either N/A or an explanation as to why they did not want to answer the question. After all of the responses of the Delphi panel were analyzed, the panel members had

provided a solid foundation of information that would eventually bring about a consensus on the subject matter.

Round 1: Findings and Analysis

Each panelist contributed valuable information and knowledgeable answers in the first Round iteration. The Delphi panel responses have been analyzed on a question-by-question basis. Confidentiality has been maintained in order to protect the panelists from being identified with individual statements. The name and organizational affiliation of each member of the Delphi panel is listed in Appendix E. Panel members were assured from the initial contact that individual responses would be used only for data analysis purposes. Anonymity was guaranteed to each panelist.

Question 1: Please list strategies that have been effective for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs.

Five criteria emerged from the responses of the Delphi panel. The use of public performances to spur interest in school programs was an important consideration of the panel members. The other criteria that received multiple responses were personal contacts with local businesses through networking; the power of shared visions between stakeholders of organizations; using grant opportunities offered by local businesses; and fostering growth through Partners In Education Programs and Adopt-a-School Programs already in existence. Receiving less support were criteria such as using parent teacher organizations, networking, and contacting new businesses to the area.

Question 2: Please list strategies that have been effective for building awareness about reduced funding for music education. How have people in your area been informed about the reduction in funds for music education?

Six items received multiple responses. The number-one concern of the panel members was using the power of both spoken and written media. The second concern of the panel was using booster clubs and parent support groups. The other items receiving multiple responses were using performances and informances to speak on the subject; using coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials; using stakeholders to write letters to government officials; and using opportunities to speak with local school boards. Other items receiving less support were sending information to administrators to inform them and teaching other educators about facts on music education.

Question 3: Please list strategies that have been effective for building community support for music education funding.

The panelists overwhelmingly agreed that public performances throughout the community helped build strong support. The other items receiving multiple responses were the need to involve booster clubs and parent support groups; to involve the use of media; to involve guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts; to involve students in festivals, conferences; and in state music events. A significant number of the panel members stated high quality teaching produced a quality product. Receiving less support were publicizing the National Standards of Music, listening to what the community wants, and providing service opportunities for students through Tri-M Music Honor Societies, which is affiliated with the Music Educators National

Conference (MENC). One panelist stated: "...the public is not very enthusiastic about spending money on mediocre programs."

Question 4: Please list strategies that increase parental support in local music education programs.

Five criteria emerged from the responses of the panel members. Once again, the use of public performance received the most responses. Four other concerns expressed by the panelists were the use of media; the use of booster clubs and parent participation; the use of strong teacher leadership, and the use of participation in state music events, conferences, and festivals. Other items receiving less support were the importance of an open-door policy, sending fun homework home to include activities for parents and students to complete together, and schools offering comprehensive and well-rounded offerings. One panelist noted: "To involve and inform the parents will give them a greater sense of ownership of the music education program."

Question 5: Please list any ideas on how to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support.

Five strategies received multiple responses by the panelists: utilizing the power of positive musical experiences, utilizing the power of media both spoken and written, utilizing the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations, and utilizing the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community, and utilizing the influence of students' achievements on administration. Items receiving less support were inviting stakeholders to events, showcasing exemplary teachers, using music support agencies like MENC, having strong leadership in the music

supervisor's position, and using public relations executives to discuss pro bono how to get the word out.

Question 6: Please list ways of educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education.

The items receiving multiple responses by the Delphi panel members were using the power of persuasion through advocacy, using invitations to administrators to visit the classroom, using successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators, using excellence in the classroom to breed more success, using professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff, and using parent groups as advocates to the administration. Other items mentioned were finding ways to attract larger audiences to concerts, incorporating music in other disciplines, incorporating administrators into programs, training music educators to become administrators, and adjusting administrative licensure programs to include course content on benefits of arts programs. One panelist stated: "Close, candid communication with the building principal is essential." Another panelist stated: "There are two types of administrators: those you work with and those you work around. If they are educable you work with them, if they are not, you work around them."

Question 7: Please list ways of gaining administrative support for music education.

Seven items received multiple responses from the Delphi panel. The two responses with the most responses were utilizing the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy and utilizing successful

communication with administrators by sharing upcoming events, successes, or asking for advice. The five other items that received multiple responses were inviting administrators to participate on programs, participating in the total school pictures, cooperating as a team player, using excellence in the classroom to breed more success, and using parents groups as advocates to administration. One panelist stated: “The material must be presented in a way that will not appear to ‘add one more layer’ to the overall program, but in a way that will reinforce what is being done and encourage more in the area.” The other strategies mentioned were publicly sharing information on finances and using the media to reach administrators.

Question 8: Please list ways of inter-disciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school.

Two strategies emerged from the panel members. The first strategy was utilizing collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics). The second strategy was utilizing professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum. Other items mentioned were involving behavior problem kids in after school programs, theme planning, and offering a mini-humanities course.

Question 9: Please list ways of gaining support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas.

The number-one response expressed by the panel members was a concern for music educators to be professional by being flexible, open minded, and cooperative. Five other desired strategies receiving multiple responses were incorporating staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledging them when they do help and attend; using the power of praise and advocacy to help students; incorporating school performances and interdisciplinary lessons throughout the school; offering to help staff members; and utilizing the tradition of success from quality music programs. The other strategies mentioned were handling discipline problems yourself, having a “Meet-the-Teach” Recital, and helping other teachers make connections through music.

Question 10: Please list successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.

Four responses emerged from the panel members. The most common answer from the panel was finding qualified people to help write the grants. Other items receiving multiple responses were using the importance of following the instructions very carefully, using the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions, and taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites. Some panel members gave very specific help, such as recommending “Foundationcenter.org” that offers self-taught tutorials. In addition, some panel members felt that grant seekers should follow up on how the money was spent and the success of the project. One panel member stated clearly that grant money rarely goes to funding performance trips.

Question 11: Please list obtainable grant sources that support music in your area.

The majority of the panel members did not respond to this question because they expressed that they have not ever written a grant proposal. The panelists who did respond offered region-specific grants that would not benefit a large population of people. Many of the panel members indicated that they did not have the skills or knowledge to fill out a grant proposal. Other panel members stated that they did not have the time to complete the long and tedious grant applications. The researcher was shocked at the lack of knowledge surrounding funding through grant writing opportunities, especially because of the highly educated group of panel members being surveyed. After thoughtful consideration, the researcher concluded that, because the average length of professional experience was 27 years, the panel members may not have had the formal educational background in their educational programs that many years ago since grant writing is a more recent trend. Because of the lack of information given and the geographical (area specific) information that was given, the researcher eliminated this question for the final survey because there would be no way that consensus could be achieved.

Question 12: Please list strategies that increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards.

The Delphi panel members gave multiple responses to five items: utilizing the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity, utilizing steady communication of advocacy facts, utilizing performance opportunities at school board meetings, utilizing invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events and publicly recognize them when they do attend, and utilizing personal contacts to proactively influence school board members. Other items that

received less support were monthly music teacher meetings to unify programs, being a cooperative employee, and seeking help from parent advocates.

Question 13: Please list ways that reduced funding for music education has impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution.

Five answers received multiple responses by the panel members: 1. loss of teachers and smaller numbers of classes, 2. lower classroom budgets and reducing new instrument and music purchases, 3. emphasis on test scores in academic areas affecting scheduling, 4. reliance on parent groups for more funding, 5. Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs, and extended educational opportunities, such as professional development. One panelist stated: “Some districts are strong arts supporters, other districts are not as supportive.” Another panelist noted: “Money allows us to reach our goals for our students and the lack of money holds us back from reaching our goals for them as well.”

Question 14: Please list any other strategy that I may have missed that would aid the support of music education.

The majority of the panel members did not respond to this question. Of the panel members who did respond, most offered encouraging words of how thorough the survey was or how they hoped their comments would be helpful. Some panelists discussed the importance of getting the word out to the public. One panelist stated: “Teachers must believe in it. Then they must take the responsibility for being an advocate and not just say, ‘I don’t have time’, and assume someone else will do it. Soon you may have all the time in the world when it’s too late.”

Summary

The narrative responses to the questions forming the first Round iteration were specific and provided a solid basis on which to develop the second Round questionnaire. Throughout this first stage of the Delphi process, areas of consensus were emerging towards developing strategies that address the effects of reduced funding for music education. The findings from the first Round formed the basis of the second Round to further narrow the opinions and perceptions of the panelists into a more unified consensus.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter contains a synopsis of the procedures and results of the second Round. Likewise, the findings of the second Round surveys are reported in this chapter. To further the Delphi process, a second Round questionnaire was sent to exactly the same panel of experts who responded to Survey One, outlined in Chapter 4. The findings of Round 2 are outlined in this chapter through the use of five major categories: the survey distribution method, the response rate, methodology of content analysis and initial findings, and a brief chapter summary. Round 2 was an unexpected and abbreviated Round because the panel members were in agreement with the results of Round 1, with the exception of one person who wanted to make some additions and revisions to both Question 6 and Question 8. The Round 2 survey is presented in Appendix C.

Survey Distribution

After tallies were complete with all of the first Round strategies listed by the Delphi panel, a second survey was sent out. This survey listed all of the responses that had received at least four tally marks, which indicated that at least four other panel members agreed with the strategy. The use of the tally marks strengthened the case of building towards consensus of the strategies by the end of the study, which as outlined in Chapter 3 is a key factor in any Delphi study.

Response Rate

Survey 2 was a listing of repeated strategies that were indicated by panelists from Survey 1. The researcher informed the panelists in the directions to Survey 2 to read

through the list of proposed strategies and contact the researcher with any questions, concerns, or comments about any one of the strategies. The researcher also explained in the directions to Survey 2 that no contact was necessary if the panel member understood and accepted the list of strategies presented by the researcher.

Some of the panel members sent back responses that showed amazement at the complete list of strategies presented. Many of the panel members sent back comments that showed they had read the complete list of strategies and agreed to each of the strategies. Likewise, most panel members made note that they were ready to rank the strategies as to their effectiveness. A number of the panelists added comments, such as: “looks great”, “keep up the good work”, and other positive and encouraging words to the researcher.

Methodology of Content Analysis: Round 2 Questionnaire

Only one panel member showed concern with some of the strategies. This panel member sent an e-mail that outlined ways that the list of strategies could be strengthened. The detailed responses by the panel member caused the researcher to pay close attention to the areas of concern. It was very apparent that this panel member had spent hours carefully perusing the information in Survey 2.

Question 6: Please list ways of educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education. The panel member explained that Question 6 needed to have an additional strategy added that suggested administrators needed to be a partner in decision-making. The panel member addressed that this strategy could fit in other places but argued that this was the most powerful place to list the additional strategy. After

carefully considering the expert opinion of the panel member looking back through the list of strategies presented, I found that other panel members had touched on this idea in several questions. After careful consideration, the researcher decided to add another strategy to Question 6, which became:

Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making.

Question 8: Please list ways of inter-disciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school. The same panel member mentioned above also addressed concerns with the wording of one of the strategies in Question 8. This expert expressed the importance of using the term “cross-curricular” to strengthen the strategy. Furthermore, the panel member showed particular concern for the researcher to address interdisciplinary opportunities and professional development opportunities in a more in-depth manner to create strong strategies for Question 8. Once again, after a careful review of what the panel member had expressed, the researcher completely reworked the list of strategies for Question 8, which ended up as follows:

Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s).

Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development.

Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning.

Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy)

Summary

The positive comments and constructive narrative responses to the questions forming the second Round iteration were specific and provided insight into making corrections and improvements where necessary. Areas of consensus were continuing to emerge towards the ranking of the strategies that address the effects of reduced funding for music education that would occur in the final Round. The findings from the second Round formed the basis of the third Round to further narrow the opinions and perceptions of the panelists into a more unified consensus through the use of a strengthened survey instrument.

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter includes a description of the procedure by which the Round 3 questionnaire was constructed, distributed, and analyzed. In addition, an explanation of the procedure utilized to organize and summarize the 12-question third round questionnaire is described in detail, along with an explanation of the scale used in the analysis. The Round 3 survey is presented in Appendix D.

Construction of Round 3 Questionnaire

The analysis of the 35 members of the Delphi panel's responses to the open-ended questions in Rounds 1 and 2 provided the information needed to develop the Round 3 questionnaire. As with all Delphi studies, the purpose of the final Round questionnaire was to further narrow the responses and to identify areas of consensus among the panel members from the responses given in the previous two surveys. In order to meet the previously mentioned objective, the researcher identified opinions with the greatest degree of agreement among the Delphi panel member on the Round 1 survey. The second survey asked for any further strategies to be listed that would be critical to the study and for any strategy that needed further clarification. Both Rounds 1 and 2 led the researcher to build a Round 3 survey that consisted of Section 1 with 12 questions with 66 subparts and Section 2 with 12 questions and 67 subparts. The final round questionnaire and cover letter were distributed once again via e-mail and are listed in Appendix D.

The answers given during the first iteration were analyzed inductively in order to identify areas of concern among the group of expert panel members. This process

involved analyzing the panel members' statements and grouping similar responses into categories of strategies for each question. The researcher maintained a count each time a Delphi member expressed related ideas. After the tabulation of category counts, the researcher found recognizable areas of consensus by the numbers of responses to certain strategies. In order to make this study manageable, the researcher created a scale that allowed shared ideas with 4 or more responses to be included as a strategy. In order to set a standard for including and excluding statements, a cut-off criterion of four was set. Therefore, any suggestion given in Round 1 that was mentioned by four panelists was included in the next two questionnaires. It is important to note that items not receiving four responses were eliminated from future consideration in this study.

As for the Round 2 survey, participants were asked to read the complete list of strategies to familiarize themselves with the ideas of the other members. After reading the second survey, participants were asked to contact the researcher with any questions or comments that related to the strategies listed. After comments were gathered, the researcher made modifications to the Round 2 survey in order to strengthen several strategies based on the suggestions of the Delphi group.

The third-round questionnaire utilized a Likert-type scale and ranking scale in order to monitor the degree of consensus among panel members. More specifically, the Likert-type scale was used to measure the degree of agreement and disagreement among the Delphi group concerning the strategies need to address the effects of reduced funding for music education. Each panelist was requested to choose a number on a scale of 1 to 5. A response of "5" indicated that the participant strongly agreed with the statement. A response of "4" indicated that the participant agreed with the statement. Choosing a "3"

indicated that the participant was neutral about the statement. A response of “2” on the scale indicated that the participant disagreed with the statement. Selecting a “1” on the scale indicated that the panelist strongly disagreed with the statement.

A second procedure in the final survey asked the panelist to rank the relevance of the items in each questions. The items are listed in rank order under each question with a complete table that outlines the rank of each strategy. It is important to note that each Section’s questions have corresponding tables. The weighted mean of the ranks was used to determine the degree of consensus among the panel members.

Round 3 Section 1: Findings and Analysis

This segment of the research study includes a summary of the items as they are related to each of the 12 questions identified in the survey. The third round of the survey addressed an evaluation of procedures and criteria utilizing a Likert five point scale. The specific scale utilized was one ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The data were analyzed with a determination of the mean of the responses and the determination of the standard deviation for each strategy rated by the 35 respondents. The following paragraphs shall address each of the 12 areas of analysis and specifically the 66 specific strategies addressed by the 12 areas.

Question 1: In your judgment, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs.

Item 1a: Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking

On a Likert-type scale of 5, this item received a mean of 4.43, with a standard deviation of .815. The Delphi panel rated this strategy as the third most important strategy in establishing partnerships with local businesses to gain support for music education programs. Thirty of the thirty-five panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 1b: Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations

The mean value of this item is 4.14, with a standard deviation of 0.845. Despite the fact that the majority of the Delphi panel agreed or strongly agreed that this was a definite strategy in establishing local business partnerships, the panel actually rated this strategy last out of all of the five possible strategies presented in this survey. Twenty-five of the panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 1c: Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses

This item received a mean of 4.37, with a standard deviation of 0.843. Once again, this strategy did receive a large majority of agree and strongly agree responses, but the panel rated it as the next to last important strategy to implement when trying to establish partnerships with local businesses for increased support of music education programs. Twenty-nine of the panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 1d: Utilize Partners In Education Programs that are already in existence

This item received a mean of 4.54, with a standard deviation of 0.561. The second highest rated strategy was that of utilizing partners in education that are already in existence. This had a mean score of 4.54 and a standard deviation of .561. In this strategy, all of the respondents rated this strategy as agree or strongly agree with the

exception of one panelists who was neutral. It should also be noted that the range of responses is less varied than the previous strategies listed due to the lower standard deviation.

Item 1e: Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs

The first area addressed by the expert respondent panel was which strategies should be used to establish partnerships with local businesses for an increased support of music education programs in the local area. There were five strategy response possibilities to rate by the respondents. The strategy deemed the most important was that of utilizing public performances to spur interest in the school programs. This strategy had a mean score of 4.86 out of a possible 5-point scale and a standard deviation of .355. The numerical data indicates that 100% of the respondents rated this strategy as either agree or strongly agree. In fact, 85% of the respondents rated this strategy as strongly agree, which illustrates strong consensus with this strategy. The statistical data for Question 1 are organized in Table 1.

Table 1, Section 1, Establishing Partnerships with Local Businesses

Question 1

In your judgment, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking	0	0	1	2.9	4	11.4	9	25.7	21	60	35	4.43	.815
Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations	0	0	0	0	10	28.6	10	28.6	15	42.9	35	4.14	.845
Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses	0	0	1	2.9	5	14.3	9	25.7	20	57.1	35	4.37	.843
Utilize Partners In Education Programs/Adopt-a School Programs that are already in existence	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	14	40.0	20	57.1	35	4.54	.561
Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14.3	30	85.7	35	4.86	.355

Question 2: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education.

Item 2a: Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.426. The Delphi panel formed consensus that this is the most important strategy in building awareness about reduced funding for music education. The numerical data indicate that 77% of the respondents rated this strategy between as strongly agree and the remaining 8% of the panelists ranked it as agree.

Item 2b: Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject

This item received a mean of 4.66, with a standard deviation of 0.639. This strategy was listed as the second most important strategy in building awareness regarding music funding issues. Another strategy tied for second place, using coalitions, which will be discussed in Item 2d, but this strategy had a lower standard deviation, which means that there was less discrepancy between the panel members on the answers.

Item 2c: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

This item received a mean of 4.63, with a standard deviation of 0.547. As the third most important strategy listed in this study, it is apparent that the majority of the panel members either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy aiding in building awareness for music education funding. As illustrated in Table 2, 65.7% of the panelists gave this strategy a strongly agree response.

Item 2d: Utilize coalitions with parents, teacher, and local higher education officials

This item received a mean of 4.66, with a standard deviation of 0.765. As mentioned under Item 2b, this strategy of using coalitions tied as the second most important strategy in building awareness for music education funding along with using performances and informances to speak on the subject. However, the standard deviation was larger in this strategy, which means that there was greater variance in the answers for this particular strategy. It is interesting to point out that audiences at performances are typically made up largely of parents and family members of students, which would link both of these strategies together.

Item 2e: Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials

This item received a mean of 4.17, with a standard deviation of 0.822. Out of all of the strategies listed under this question, this strategy of using stakeholders to write letters to government officials was rated as the least important strategy even though the mean indicates that the Delphi panel does agree or strongly agree that it is an important strategy to combat funding issues. The numerical data prove that 80% of the panelists gave either an agree or a strongly agree response. Only one panelist disagreed with this strategy, and six other panelists were neutral on this issue.

Item 2f: Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards

This item received a mean of 4.51, with a standard deviation of 0.562. Once again, even though the panel agrees or strongly agrees to the importance of this strategy, it is rated as the next to last strategy in order of importance. It is important to note that the range of responses is less varied than the previous question because 34 out of the 35 panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy. The statistical data for Question 2 are organized in Table 2.

Table 2, Section 1, Building Awareness about Reduced Funding
Question 2

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	4.77	.426
Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	9	25.7	25	71.4	35	4.66	.639
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	11	31.4	23	65.7	35	4.63	.547
Utilize coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials	0	0	2	5.7	0	0	6	17.1	27	77.1	35	4.66	.765
Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials	0	0	1	2.9	6	17.1	14	40.0	14	40.0	35	4.17	.822
Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	15	42.9	19	54.3	35	4.51	.562

Question 3: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding.

Item 3a: Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.426. In building community support for music education funding, the Delphi panel displayed strong support for this strategy by rating it in a tie for second place along with Item 3c, using performances throughout the community. Interestingly enough, 100% of the respondents rated this strategy as an agree or strongly agree with the preponderance rating it a strongly agree.

Item 3b: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

This item received a mean of 4.69, with a standard deviation of 0.583. Due to the majority of the respondents answering agree or strongly agree, using the power of media to build community support is an important strategy, which is why the panel rated it the third most important strategy. The numerical data indicate that 74.3% of the Delphi panel members strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 3c: Utilize the power of performances throughout the community

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.490. As mentioned in Item 3a, the power of performances was rated in a tie for second place along with using booster clubs and parent support groups to help build community support for music education funding. It is important to note that the standard deviation is higher in this strategy than in Item 3a, thus displaying that there were slightly more varied answers in this particular strategy, which is due to a panel member marking a neutral response that broadened the range of responses. To illustrate this, 80% of the

respondents rated this strategy as agree or strongly agree with the preponderance rating it a strongly agree, 17.1% agreed with this strategy, and 2.9% of the panel marked neutral.

Item 3d: Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts

This item received a mean of 4.26, with a standard deviation of 0.741. Even though the Delphi panel rated this strategy as the fourth most important strategy in building community support, the mean score displays a consensus in the importance of the strategy due to the high number of agree and strongly agree responses.

Item 3e: Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals

This item received a mean of 4.23, with a standard deviation of 0.808. Once again, the Delphi panel found consensus in the fact that participation in state music events, conferences, and festivals was important in building community support by the large number (82.9%) of agree and strongly agree responses. However, the panel rated this as the least important strategy mentioned in this question.

Item 3f: Utilize quality teaching for a quality product

This item received a mean of 4.86, with a standard deviation of 0.430. The panel rated this item as the most important strategy in building community support. The 4.86 mean denotes that the majority of the panel agrees and strongly agrees with this statement. In fact, 31 out of the 35 respondents rated this strategy a 5 (strongly agree) on the Likert scale. The statistical data for Question 3 are organized in Table 3

Table 3, Section 1, Building Community Support

Question 3

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	4.77	.426
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	7	20.0	26	74.3	35	4.69	.583
Utilize the power of performances throughout the community	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	6	17.1	28	80.0	35	4.77	.490
Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	14	40.0	15	42.9	35	4.26	.741
Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals	0	0	1	2.9	5	14.3	14	40.0	15	42.9	35	4.23	.808
Utilize quality teaching for a quality product	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	3	8.6	31	88.6	35	4.86	.430

Question 4: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs.

Item 4a: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

This item received a mean of 4.54, with a standard deviation of 0.657. The power of using media to increase parental support was rated as the third most important strategy with this particular question. The mean of 4.54 indicates consensus among the panel that this is a valid strategy. Twenty-two out of the 35 respondents strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 4b: Utilize the power of quality public performances

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.382. The panel formed consensus that the power of quality public performances and utilizing strong teacher leadership were both the most important strategies when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs. The above figures show that 82.9% of the respondents rated this strategy as a 5.0 on the Likert scale.

Item 4c: Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation

This item received a mean of 4.74, with a standard deviation of 0.443. As the second most important strategy to this question, 100% of the respondents rated this strategy between a 4.0 and 5.0 on the Likert-type scale, which indicates consensus with the panelists rating this strategy as an agree or strongly agree rating.

Item 4d: Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals

This item received a mean of 4.46, with a standard deviation of 0.611. Despite the high mean, the panel rated this item as the least important strategy when trying to gain parental support. One might argue that these events are usually during the day, which

might decrease the numbers of parents who could attend these events due to work related issues. Additionally important is the fact that some festival and conferences performances are in other areas of the state or other states, which would drastically decrease the amount of parental involvement at these events.

Item 4e: Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.514. As mentioned earlier, the panel rated this strategy along with the power of quality public performances as the most important strategies when trying to gain support from parents. The variance is slightly larger than Item 4b because two panelists marked neutral as the response to this question, but 88.6% of the respondents ranked this strategy as strongly agree on the Likert scale, which indicates the majority of the respondents strongly agree with the strategy of strong teacher leadership.

Item 4f: Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information

This item received a mean of 4.54, with a standard deviation of 0.657. The Delphi panel rated this item as the next to last strategy in gaining parental support. As educators the power of praise and the sharing of specific information is important, but often times, students do not share information with their parents, which would make this a less effective strategy in trying increase parental support. The statistical data for Question 4 are organized in Table 4.

Table 4, Section 1, Increasing Parental Support

Question 4

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	10	28.6	22	62.9	35	4.54	.657
Utilize the power of quality public performances	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	29	82.9	35	4.83	.382
Utilize individual parent participation and booster club	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	25.7	26	74.3	35	4.74	.443
Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	15	42.9	18	51.4	35	4.46	.611
Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	2	5.7	31	88.6	35	4.83	.514
Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	10	28.6	22	62.9	35	4.54	.657

Question 5: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support.

Item 5a: Utilize the power of positive musical experiences

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.382. The Delphi panel rated this strategy as the most important strategy in sharing music education facts and benefits with the public in order to gain support. In fact, 82.9% of the panel ranked this strategy as strongly agree indicating strong consensus in the importance of the strategy.

Item 5b: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

This item received a mean of 4.57, with a standard deviation of 0.608. Even though the panel formed consensus, displayed by the 4.57 mean on a 5.0 scale, that this was an important strategy in gaining support for music education, the panel rated it as the least important strategy in comparison with the other strategies listed under the umbrella of this question.

Item 5c: Utilize the power of visibility through public performances/
demonstrations

This item received a mean of 4.80, with a standard deviation of 0.406. The panel rated this strategy of using public performance to gain public support for music education as the second most important strategy. To illustrate the degree of consensus on this strategy, 100% of the panel ranked this strategy between a 4.0 to a 5.0, which indicates that all of the respondents rated this strategy as an agree or strongly agree with the preponderance rating it a strongly agree.

Item 5d: Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)

This item received a mean of 4.60, with a standard deviation of 0.604. The panel rated this strategy of using opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community as the next to last important strategy in gathering public support for music education in comparison with the other strategies listed under this question.

Item 5e: Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration

This item received a mean of 4.69, with a standard deviation of 0.530. The Delphi panel rated this strategy of using the influence of students' achievements on administration as the third most important strategy when attempting to share facts and benefits with the public to gain support. All of the panelists except one ranked this strategy as agree or strongly agree. The statistical data for Question 5 are organized in Table 5.

Table 5, Section 1, Sharing Facts and Benefits with the Public

Question 5

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize the power of positive musical experiences	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	29	82.9	35	4.83	.382
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	11	31.4	22	62.9	35	4.57	.608
Utilize the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	20.0	28	80.0	35	4.80	.406
Utilize the opportunities to speak On advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	10	28.6	23	65.7	35	4.60	.604
Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	9	25.7	25	71.4	35	4.69	.530

Question 6: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education.

Item 6a: Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison test scores

This item received a mean of 4.34, with a standard deviation of 0.802. The Delphi panel rated this item sixth out of seven possible choices, which indicates that the panel felt that this strategy was a solid strategy, but not the most important strategy listed under the umbrella of this question. It is important to note that four panelists marked neutral responses and one panelist disagreed with the importance of the strategy.

Item 6b: Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom

This item received a mean of 4.71, with a standard deviation of 0.519. When rating strategies for this question, the Delphi panel ranked this item as 4th out of 7 possible strategies, but 74.3% of the panelists rated this as strongly agree.

Item 6c: Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.426. Delphi panel members concurred that this strategy was important because 100% of the panelists rated this strategy between 4.0 to a 5.0, which would indicate they agreed or strongly agreed to the use of this strategy when educating administrators on the importance of music education. The panel rated this item as the third most important strategy with this question.

Item 6d: Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success

This item received a mean of 4.8, with a standard deviation of 0.473. The panel members rated this strategy of using excellence in the classroom to breed more success number two out of seven possible choices. This is an indication that the panel members gave this item a high priority.

Item 6e: Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.382. The Delphi panel indicated that using professional behavior through cooperation with all staff members was the most important strategy when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education. Not surprising, 82.9% of the panel rated this strategy as a 5.0 indicating that the majority of the panel members strongly agreed to the significance of this strategy when dealing with building level administrators.

Item 6f: Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

This item received a mean of 4.29, with a standard deviation of 0.893. Support from the Delphi panel was weak for this strategy. Panelists rated it the least important strategy when attempting to educate building level administrators on the benefits of music education. The numerical data indicates that one panelist actually strongly disagreed with the importance of this strategy, which could be related to a personal situation that did not work out well.

Item 6g: Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making

This item received a mean of 4.49, with a standard deviation of 0.702. As mentioned above, support for this item was also weak due to the rating of 5th out of 7

possible strategies. It is important to note that the mean of 4.49 indicated that the panelists do feel that it is an important strategy, but just not one of the most important strategies. The statistical data for Question 6 are organized in Table 6.

Table 6, Section 1, Educating Building Level Administrators on Benefits

Question 6

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)	0	0	1	2.9	4	11.4	12	34.3	18	51.4	35	4.34	.802
Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	8	22.9	26	74.3	35	4.71	.519
Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	4.77	.426
Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	5	14.3	29	82.9	35	4.80	.473
Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	29	82.9	35	4.83	.382
Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration	1	2.9	0	0	4	11.4	13	37.1	17	48.6	35	4.29	.893
Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	10	28.6	21	60.0	35	4.49	.702

Question 7: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education.

Item 7a: Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”

This item received a mean of 4.71, with a standard deviation of 0.622. The Delphi panel supported the idea behind the strategy of using opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”, but they rated it as the 4th most important strategy out of 6 possible strategies. One panelist rated this strategy as strongly disagree, but 97.1% of the panelists agreed or strongly agreed with the strategy.

Item 7b: Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy

This item received a mean of 4.63, with a standard deviation of 0.547. Although the panelists rated this item 5th out of 6 possible strategies, 65.7% rated this item a 5.0, which indicated the majority of the panelists strongly agreed with the importance of using advocacy to increase support for music education on the overall education of the student.

Item 7c: Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.426. When compared with the other strategies listed under this question, the panel rated it third out of six possible strategies. This would suggest that keeping administrators abreast of upcoming events, sharing current success stories, and asking for advice are all key in building administrator support for music education.

Item 7d: Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.382. Using professional behavior by cooperating as a team player was listed as the second most important strategy in gaining administrative support for music education. This indicates the consensus of the panel members that professional attitudes do impact the way administrators view educators and ultimately their classes and programs. The numerical data confirm this because 82.9% of the panelists strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 7e: Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success

This item received a mean of 4.89, with a standard deviation of 0.323. Panelists indicated that using excellence in the classroom to breed more success was viewed as the most critical element in gaining administrative support for music education. Not surprising, 100% of the panelists rated this strategy between a 4.0 and a 5.0 indicating the majority of the panel members agreed or strongly agreed to the importance of this strategy with the preponderance of the panelists strongly agreeing to the importance of this item.

Item 7f: Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

This item received a mean of 4.29, with a standard deviation of 0.860. Members of the Delphi panel rated this item last out of six possible choices. Interestingly enough, the panel ranked parent support groups as key strategies on questions dealing with increased local support for music education and for building awareness about reduced funding for music education, but when trying to gain administrative support, the panel rated using parent groups as the least most important strategy. It is important to note that one panelists denoted the relative importance level for this item as strongly disagree,

which created a larger variance as displayed in the high standard deviation. The statistical data for Question 7 are organized in Table 7.

Table 7, Section 1, Gaining Administrative Support
Question 7

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	7	20.0	27	77.1	35	4.71	.622
Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	11	31.4	23	65.7	35	4.63	.547
Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	4.77	.426
Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	29	82.9	35	4.83	.382
Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	31	88.6	35	4.89	.323
Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration	1	2.9	0	0	3	8.6	15	42.9	16	45.7	35	4.29	.860

Question 8: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school.

Item 8a: Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)

This item received a mean of 4.49, with a standard deviation of 0.702. The panel members rated this strategy of using cross-curricular conceptual and process themes as the second most important strategy when trying to implement interdisciplinary learning with other areas of the school. Twenty-one out of the 35 panelists strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 8b: Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development

This item received a mean of 4.51, with a standard deviation of 0.612. Members of the panel deemed this strategy as the most important strategy along with Item 8c. The standard deviation of .612 displayed a slightly smaller range of answers when compared with the standard deviation of Item 8c, which was .658. Two panelists were neutral on this item.

Item 8c: Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning

This item received a mean of 4.51, with a standard deviation of 0.658. As mentioned above, the panelists considered both using professional development opportunities and interdisciplinary opportunities as the most important strategies when linking music with other departments, subjects, or clubs within schools. Three panelists marked this strategy with a neutral rating.

Item 8d: Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, and literacy)

This item received a mean of 4.34, with a standard deviation of 0.725. This strategy received the weakest area of support among the panel members. Interestingly enough, this strategy was repeated more than any other strategy during the first round questionnaire. Thirty out of the 35 panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy, but the preponderance was with the agree rating instead of strongly agree, which would account for a slightly lower mean. The statistical data for Question 8 are organized in Table 8.

Table 8, Section 1, Interdisciplinary Learning

Question 8

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	10	28.6	21	60	35	4.49	.702
Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	13	37.1	20	57.1	35	4.51	.612

Question 8 (cont'd)

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	11	31.4	21	60.0	35	4.51	.658
Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy)	0	0	0	0	5	14.3	13	37.1	17	48.6	35	4.34	.725

Question 9: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas.

Item 9a: Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend

This item received a mean of 4.60, with a standard deviation of 0.604. Out of 6 possible strategies given under this question, the panel members rated incorporating staff members in programs and public acknowledgement as the 4th most important strategy. It is important to note that the mean of 4.60 does suggest a consensus in the need for the strategy, which coincides with the numerical data showing that 94.3% of the panelists either agreed or strongly agreed to this strategy.

Item 9b: Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students

This item received a mean of 4.51, with a standard deviation of 0.612. Utilizing the power of praise and advocacy to help students was rated last out of all 6 possible strategies. The results of the placement is not surprising due to the fact that, strategies using the word advocacy have been repeatedly ranked the least important strategy or near the bottom on the rung of importance in this study.

Item 9c: Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)

This item received a mean of 4.89, with a standard deviation of 0.323. With much uniformity, the Delphi panel ranked this item the most important strategy when attempting to gain support from other teachers of other subject areas. It is noteworthy that 88.6% of the panel members deemed the relative importance level for this item a 5.0,

which indicates that the majority of the panel members strongly agreed with using the influence of professional attitudes to gain school-wide support.

Item 9d: Utilize interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school

This item received a mean of 4.69, with a standard deviation of 0.583. The Delphi panel indicated that using interdisciplinary lessons and school performances was the second most important strategy when attempting to gain support for music education from the entire school. Twenty-six of the panelists strongly agreed with this item.

Item 9e: Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them

This item received a mean of 4.57, with a standard deviation of 0.608. Using opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them was rated 5th out of 6 possible strategies listed with this question. The panel obviously supported Item 9e as a strategy but did not indicate that it was one of the most important strategies when trying to increase school support of music education. Two panelists were neutral on this item.

Item 9f: Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs

This item received a mean of 4.63, with a standard deviation of 0.646. Using the tradition of success from quality music programs to build school-wide support for music education was listed at the 3rd most important strategy out of the possible 6 strategies listed for this question. This particular strategy on success can also be related to a strategy listed for Questions 6 and 7, which lists using excellence to breed more success. Upon further research, the two other times that using excellence in the classroom to breed more success were used in this survey, these strategies were listed both 2nd and 1st in their

respective strategy pools. Interestingly enough, three of the panelists were neutral on the importance of this strategy, but 32 either agreed or strongly agreed. The three neutral responses lowered the mean of this strategy that lowered the rating from second to third place. The statistical data for Question 9 are organized in Table 9.

Table 9, Section 1, Gaining Support from other Teachers/Professors

Question 9

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	10	28.6	23	65.7	35	4.60	.604
Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	13	37.1	20	57.1	35	4.51	.612
Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	31	88.6	35	4.89	.323
Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	7	20.0	26	74.3	35	4.69	.583
Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	11	31.4	22	62.9	35	4.57	.608
Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	7	20	25	71.4	35	4.63	.646

Question 10: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.

Item 10a: Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully

This item received a mean of 4.74, with a standard deviation of 0.611. The Delphi panel members rated this item number 2 out of the four possible choices for this question. Twenty-nine out of the 35 panelists rated this a 5.0 on the Likert scale, which indicated that 82.9% of the panelists strongly agreed with the importance of this strategy.

Item 10b: Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions

This item received a mean of 4.80, with a standard deviation of 0.531. Panel members rated this item number 1 overall. In fact, 94.3% of the panelists rated this strategy between a 4.0 to a 5.0, which indicates a consensus that the majority of the panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with this strategy of addressing specific items outlined in the directions of grants.

Item 10c: Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)

This item received a mean of 4.60, with a standard deviation of 0.553. This item was rated number 3 out of four possible choices for this question. Due to the mean of 4.60, the panel was able to reach consensus that using other professionals to help with grant writing is a key success factor in obtaining grant money. One panelists was neutral on the importance of this item.

Item 10d: Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites

This item received a mean of 4.43, with a standard deviation of 0.739. The rather large standard deviation for this strategy, as well as the other strategies listed under Question 10, indicate that there is some disagreement within the body of experts on grant writing. Even though the panelists were asked to assign numerical answers to each strategy, a significant number of panelists wrote notes to the researcher after their numeric responses. All of the notes listed under Question 10 addressed the fact that many of the panelists had little to no experience in grant writing, which would explain the larger standard deviations and lower means listed under Question 10. More specifically, five panelists rated this item as neutral, which would also account for a larger variance between the numbers. The statistical data for Question 10 are organized in Table 10.

Table 10, Section 1, Gaining Successful Methods for Preparing Grants

Question 10

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	3	8.6	29	82.9	35	4.74	.611
Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions	0	0	0	0	2	5.7	3	8.6	30	85.7	35	4.80	.531
Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	12	34.3	22	62.9	35	4.60	.553
Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites	0	0	0	0	5	14.3	10	28.3	20	57.1	35	4.43	.739

Question 11: In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards.

Item 11a: Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity

This item received a mean of 4.77, with a standard deviation of 0.426. The panel members deemed the relative importance level for this item as number 2 for this question out of a possible 5 answers. More specifically, 100% of the respondents rated this strategy between a 4.0 to a 5 or to contextually place this within the scale, that all of the respondents rated this strategy as an agree or strongly agree with the preponderance rating it a strongly agree.

Item 11b: Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts

This item received a mean of 4.46, with a standard deviation of 0.852. This item was rated in a tie for 3rd place along with Item 11c, using performance opportunities at school board meetings. As previously mentioned, any time advocacy has been used in a strategy it has not been rated as a most important strategy. One panelist did rate this as strongly disagree, which does account for the large variance on this item.

Item 11c: Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings

This item received a mean of 4.46, with a standard deviation of 0.780. Already noted, this strategy of using performance opportunities received a third place rating along with using steady communication of advocacy facts. The use of public performance opportunities did have a slightly smaller standard deviation indicating that the variance or spread of the answers was smaller than Item 11b, but 60% of the panelists did strongly agreed with this strategy.

Item 11d: Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend

This item received a mean of 4.83, with a standard deviation of 0.382. Panel members rated this item as the most important strategy when trying to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards. Not surprising, 82.9% of the panel members rated this strategy a 5.0 indicating the majority of the panel members strongly agreed with the importance of the strategy. All of the other panelists agreed with the strategy as well.

Item 11e: Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members

This item received a mean of 4.31, with a standard deviation of 0.832. Using personal contacts to proactively influence school board members was rated as the least important strategy when trying to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards. Interestingly enough, 17.2% of the panelists listed either neutral or disagree on this item. The statistical data for Question 11 are organized in Table 11.

Table 11, Section 1, Increasing Awareness of the Benefits

Question 11

In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	22.9	27	77.1	35	4.77	.426
Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts	1	2.9	0	0	2	5.7	11	31.4	21	60.0	35	4.46	.852
Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings	0	0	1	2.9	3	8.6	10	28.6	21	60.0	35	4.46	.780
Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.1	29	82.9	35	4.83	.382
Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members	0	0	1	2.9	5	14.3	11	31.4	18	51.4	35	4.31	.832

Question 12: In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution.

Item 12a: Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes

This item received a mean of 3.51, with a standard deviation of 1.222. Panelists rated this strategy as the 3rd most important strategy out of 6 possible strategies in Question 12. The large standard deviation indicates a wide spread in the actual responses from the panel members. It is important to note that all of the higher education panel members noted that they have not had any losses in teachers or smaller classes, which could have skewed the results of this question because they answered with disagree and strongly disagree responses. In contrast, the opinions of the public school educators were more agree than disagree.

Item 12b: Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases

This item received a mean of 3.54, with a standard deviation of 1.336. The panel members rated this item as the second most important strategy of reduced funding for music education in correlation with curricular decisions in the past five years. Once again, the large standard deviation shows disagreement among the Delphi panel, but that is in large part due to the higher education panel members who expressed no budgetary cuts. It is important to note that the numerical data show that 28.6% of the panelists either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the importance of this strategy.

Item 12c: Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling

This item received a mean of 4.11, with a standard deviation of 1.022. Panel members rated the emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affect scheduling as

the most important strategy in Question 12. The higher education panelists are believed to have also skewed the range of answers for this question due to the large standard deviation. However, it is important to note that public education panel members and other genres of panelists did agree with this strategy as displayed by the mean of 4.11. Twenty-five of the 35 panelists either agreed or strongly agreed with the importance of this strategy. Therefore, roughly a third of the panel disagrees or strongly disagree.

Item 12d: Reliance on parent groups for more funding

This item received a mean of 3.54, with a standard deviation of 1.094. The panel members rated this item the second most important strategy for Question 12. In other questions relating to parental involvement, the panel has all but one time rated this as a critical factor. The only time parent involvement was not listed as an important strategy was in conjunction with advocacy with administrators. The large standard deviation could once again be representative of the higher education panel members who rarely depend on students' parents for funding. The numerical data shows that six of the panelists either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the importance of this strategy.

Item 12e: Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers

This item received a mean of 3.46, with a standard deviation of 1.197. The panelists rated this item as the next to last strategy for Question 12. Basically, the Delphi panel here displayed a mixed reaction to the importance of this strategy. Extended educational opportunities and professional development being at the expense of the teachers could be taken several ways. The inclusion of this as a strategy came from the numerous responses from public educators. Therefore, higher education panel members

could have skewed the results of this question by marking neutral. To illustrate this, six of the panel members were neutral on this strategy, while nine other panelists were in some form of disagreement to this item.

Item 12f: Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs

This item received a mean of 2.63, with a standard deviation of 0.910. The panel members rated this strategy as the least important strategy in relation to Question 12. The low mean suggests a consensus with a disagreement with the statement. The .910 standard deviation, which happens to be the lowest standard deviation in Question 12, suggests the panel members disagree with greater uniformity than with any other question in the entire survey. It is important to note that all of the Delphi panel members knew the principal researcher once taught at a performing arts magnet school because it was listed in the first letter to the panelists. This information could have skewed the answers for this question. In this question alone, 40% of the panelists were neutral and 45.7% of the panelists were in some form of disagreement with the importance or accuracy of the strategy. The statistical data for Question 12 are organized in Table 12.

Table 12, Section 1, Impacted Curricular Decision-Making

Question 12

In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education that have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution:

Strategies	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes	3	8.6	3	8.6	11	31.4	9	25.7	9	25.7	35	3.51	1.222
Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases	3	8.6	7	20.0	3	8.6	12	34.3	10	28.6	35	3.54	1.336
Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling	0	0	3	8.6	7	20.0	8	22.9	17	48.6	35	4.11	1.022
Reliance on parent groups for more Funding	2	5.7	4	11.4	8	22.9	15	42.9	6	17.1	35	3.54	1.094
Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers	2	5.7	7	20.0	6	17.1	13	37.1	7	20.0	35	3.46	1.197
Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs	3	8.6	13	37.1	14	40.0	4	11.4	1	2.9	35	2.63	.910

Round 3 Section 2: Findings and Analysis

Section 2 of the final survey asked the panelist to rank the relevance of the items in each question in order of importance. The items are listed in rank order under each question with a complete table that outlines the rank of each strategy, which is shown in Appendix F. The weighted mean of the rank was used to determine the degree of consensus among the panel members as to the importance or strength of each strategy.

The following ranked strategy lists shall address each of the 12 areas of analysis and specifically the 67 specific strategies addressed by the 12 areas. These ranking lists are self-explanatory.

Question 1: In your judgment, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs.

1. Item 1a: Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking
2. Item 1e: Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs
3. Item 1d: Utilize Partners In Education Programs that are already in existence
4. Item 1b: Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/ organizations
5. Item 1c: Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses

The statistical data for Question 1 are organized in Table 13.

Table 13, Section 2, Establishing Partnerships with Local Businesses

Question 1

In your judgment, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking	11	8	6	6	4	-	-	35	2.54	1.400
Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations	4	8	7	7	9	-	-	35	3.26	1.379
Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses	1	4	7	12	11	-	-	35	3.80	1.106
Utilize Partners In Education Programs/Adopt-a School Programs that are already in existence	7	9	7	7	5	-	-	35	2.83	1.361
Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs	12	6	8	3	6	-	-	35	2.57	1.481

Question 2: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education.

1. Item 2b: Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject
2. Item 2d: Utilize coalitions with parents, teacher, and local higher education officials
3. Item 2a: Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups
4. Item 2f: Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards
5. Item 2c: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
6. Item 2e: Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials

The statistical data for Question 2 are organized in Table 14.

Table 14, Section 2, Building Awareness about Reduced Funding
 Question 2

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups	6	7	5	7	7	3	-	35	3.31	1.623
Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject	12	7	6	7	1	2	-	35	2.54	1.502
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	4	7	5	9	5	5	-	35	3.54	1.597
Utilize coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials	8	4	8	4	7	4	-	35	3.29	1.725
Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials	0	2	6	4	8	15	-	35	4.80	1.324
Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards	5	8	5	4	7	6	-	35	3.51	1.755

Question 3: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding.

1. Item 3c: Utilize the power of performances throughout the community
2. Item 3f: Utilize quality teaching for a quality product
3. Item 3a: Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups
4. Item 3b: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
5. Item 3e: Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
6. Item 3d: Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts

The statistical data for Question 3 are organized in Table 15.

Table 15, Section 2, Building Community Support

Question 3

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups	3	6	9	9	4	4	-	35	3.49	1.442
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	5	5	5	6	8	6	-	35	3.71	1.708
Utilize the power of performances throughout the community	12	11	7	2	2	1	-	35	2.26	1.314
Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts	1	4	2	8	6	14	-	35	4.60	1.499
Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals	0	3	7	6	11	8	-	35	4.40	1.288
Utilize quality teaching for a quality product	13	6	5	4	4	3	-	35	2.69	1.728

Question 4: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs.

1. Item 4b: Utilize the power of quality public performance
2. Item 4e: Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)
3. Item 4c: Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation
4. Item 4f: Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information
5. Item 4a: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
6. Item 4d: Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals

The statistical data for Question 4 are organized in Table 16.

Table 16, Section 2, Increasing Parental Support

Question 4

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	5	3	4	3	8	12	-	35	4.20	1.844
Utilize the power of quality public	12	5	12	4	2	-	-	35	2.40	1.241
Utilize individual parent participation and booster club	3	11	5	8	6	2	-	35	3.26	1.442
Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals	-	-	1	12	13	9	-	35	4.86	.846
Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)	12	7	6	5	3	2	-	35	2.60	1.576
Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information	3	9	7	3	3	10	-	35	3.69	1.795

Question 5: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support.

1. Item 5a: Utilize the power of positive musical experiences
1. Item 5c: Utilize the power of visibility through public performances/
demonstrations
3. Item 5d: Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the
community (performances, forums, local community service groups)
4. Item 5b: Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
5. Item 5e: Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration

The statistical data for Question 5 are organized in Table 17.

Table 17, Section 2, Sharing Facts and Benefits with the Public

Question 5

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize the power of positive	10	8	14	3	-	-	-	35	2.29	.987
Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written	3	6	7	8	11	-	-	35	3.51	1.337
Utilize the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations	12	11	5	4	3	-	-	35	2.29	1.296
Utilize the opportunities to speak On advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)	7	5	3	14	6	-	-	35	3.20	1.431
Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration	3	5	6	6	15	-	-	35	3.71	1.384

Question 6: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education.

1. Item 6d: Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
2. Item 6b: Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom
3. Item 6e: Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff
4. Item 6a: Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison test scores
4. Item 6c: Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators
6. Item 6g: Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making
7. Item 6f: Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

The statistical data for Question 6 are organized in Table 18.

Table 18, Section 2, Educating Building Level Administrators on Benefits

Question 6

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)	7	6	2	4	5	4	7	35	3.97	2.256
Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom	8	7	6	7	4	3	-	35	3.03	1.618
Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators	3	5	9	5	5	2	6	35	3.97	1.902
Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success	12	8	4	4	4	3	-	35	2.69	1.711
Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff	3	4	8	8	6	2	4	35	3.91	1.721
Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration	1	2	2	4	3	16	7	35	5.34	1.589
Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making	1	3	4	4	9	5	9	35	4.94	1.74

Question 7: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education.

1. Item 7c: Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)
2. Item 7e: Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
3. Item 7b: Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy
4. Item 7b: Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”
5. Item 7d: Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player
6. Item 7a: Utilize invitations to administrators to participate on programs
7. Item 7f: Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

The statistical data for Question 7 are organized in Table 19. (Please note that a one to one correlation of analysis on Question 7 is impossible because the researcher inadvertently left out one strategy in Section 1 of the Round 3 survey. This strategy ranked 6 out of the 7 strategies, which indicate this strategy had little to no effect on the study.

Table 19, Section 2, Gaining Administrative Support

Question 7

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize invitations to administrators to participate on programs	5	1	5	4	5	9	6	35	4.54	2.020
Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”	2	7	8	8	7	-	3	35	3.66	1.571
Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy	7	9	3	3	4	5	4	35	3.54	2.133
Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)	5	7	7	7	5	3	1	35	3.37	1.646
Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player	3	4	5	8	8	4	3	35	4.09	1.704
Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success	13	2	5	3	2	4	6	35	3.43	2.367
Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration	5	2	1	4	10	12	1	35	5.49	1.821

Question 8: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school.

1. Item 8a: Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)
2. Item 8c: Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning
3. Item 8d: Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, and literacy)
4. Item 8b: Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development.

The statistical data for Question 8 are organized in Table 20.

Table 20, Section 2, Interdisciplinary Learning

Question 8

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)	12	9	8	6	-	-	-	35	2.23	1.114
Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development	5	9	10	11	-	-	-	35	2.77	1.060

Question 20 (cont'd)

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning	8	11	9	7	-	-	-	35	2.43	1.065
Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy	9	6	8	12	-	-	-	35	2.66	1.211

Question 9: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas.

1. Item 9d: Utilize interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school
2. Item 9a: Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend
3. Item 9c: Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)
4. Item 9e: Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them
5. Item 9b: Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students
5. Item 9f: Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs

The statistical data for Question 9 are organized in Table 21.

Table 21, Section 2, Gaining Support from other Teachers/Professors

Question 9

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend	7	8	8	5	3	4	-	35	3.03	1.618
Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students	3	4	8	5	8	7	-	35	3.91	1.597
Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)	5	9	5	5	8	3	-	35	3.31	1.623
Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school	11	2	5	10	3	4	-	35	3.11	1.745
Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them	3	9	3	5	10	5	-	35	3.71	1.655
Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs	6	3	6	5	3	12	-	35	3.91	1.900

Question 10: In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.

1. Item 10a: Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully
2. Item 10b: Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions
2. Item 10d: Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites
4. Item 10c: Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)

The statistical data for Question 10 are organized in Table 22.

Table 22, Section 2, Gaining Successful Methods for Preparing Grants

Question 10

In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully	14	6	8	7	-	-	-	35	2.23	1.190
Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions	4	14	10	7	-	-	-	35	2.57	.948
Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)	5	11	11	8	-	-	-	35	2.63	1.003
Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites	12	4	6	13	-	-	-	35	2.57	1.313

Question 11: In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards.

1. Item 11b: Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts
2. Item 11a: Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity
3. Item 11d: Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend
4. Item 11c: Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings
5. Item 11e: Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members

The statistical data for Question 11 are organized in Table 23.

Table 23, Section 2, Increasing Awareness of the Benefits

Question 11

In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity	13	10	5	4	3	-	-	35	2.26	1.314
Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts	6	5	7	7	10	-	-	35	3.29	1.467
Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings	5	7	11	4	8	-	-	35	3.09	1.358
Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend	6	11	9	9	-	-	-	35	2.60	1.063
Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members	5	2	3	11	14	-	-	35	3.77	1.416

Question 12: In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution.

1. Item 12c: Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling
2. Item 12b: Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases
3. Item 12a: Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes
4. Item 12d: Reliance on parent groups for more funding
5. Item 12e: Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers
6. Item 12f: Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs

The statistical data for Question 12 are organized in Table 24.

Table 24, Section 2, Impacted Curricular Decision-Making

Question 12

In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education that have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution:

Strategies	Frequency of Rank Order (Most Important to Least Important)							N	<u>M</u> Rank	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes	9	10	5	5	5	1	-	35	2.71	1.506
Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases	7	8	14	4	2	-	-	35	2.66	1.259
Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling	15	6	8	5	1	-	-	35	2.17	1.224
Reliance on parent groups for more Funding	3	7	3	12	7	3	-	35	3.63	1.457
Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers	1	1	4	7	18	4	-	35	4.49	1.121
Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs	-	3	1	2	4	25	-	35	5.34	1.259

Summary of Survey 3

This chapter contains the analysis of the numerical data used to determine areas of consensus for *Strategies to Address the Effects of Reduced Funding for Music Education*. The 12 questions and 66 subparts of Section 1 and the 12 questions and 67 subparts of Section 2 were analyzed separately with Section 1 depicting the most effective strategies and Section 2 listing the ranking order of the strategies as determined by the 35 members of the Delphi panel. The responses of the Delphi panel members were measured by two different methods. Section 1 asked each panelists to determine the relative importance level by rating each strategy on a Likert-type scale of 1-5 with “5” being strongly agree to “1” being strongly disagree. In contrast, Section 2 asked panel members to rank the strategies of each question in order of importance. An analysis of the data uncovers strategies that can or should be implemented in order to address the effects of reduced funding for music education.

Chapter 7 contains recommendations and conclusions based on the findings of the research study. A detailed description of specific areas of further study that need to occur on this topic is included in this chapter as well.

CHAPTER 7

INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction and Review of the Study

A thorough description of the Delphi methodology used in this study was described in Chapter 3. More specifically, the history, applications, methods of study, and the criteria of the Delphi panel selection process were discussed at length. Chapter 4 included specific information regarding the Delphi panel and the analysis of the data from the Round 1 questionnaire containing 14 questions concerning *Strategies to Address the Effects of Reduced Funding for Music Education*. In Round 1, the panel members were asked to list strategies or suggestions to the open-ended questions concerning the topic on music education funding. Items receiving four or more similar responses were compiled into a list of strategies that were sent back to the Delphi panel in the Round 2 questionnaire, which was outlined in Chapter 5. Also, in Chapter 5 are the revisions that were made to the complete list of strategies that served to clarify any problematic statements and to strengthen the final survey instrument.

The final Round questionnaire for Round 3 was built from the strategies that were agreed upon in Round 2. Each Delphi panel member ranked the strategies on a Likert-type scale of 1-5, which “5” being strongly agree and “1” being strongly disagree. The analysis and findings of Round 3 were outlined in Chapter 6. Varying degrees of consensus were reached on Survey 3 Questions 1-11, but on Question 12 consensus was not achieved due to the wide range in answers.

This chapter melds the strategies given and ranked by the expert Delphi panel members into conclusions and recommendations using the 3 Research Questions to direct

the dissertation. The purpose of the Delphi technique was not to produce statistically proven strategies for this topic, but instead the purpose was to produce a list of strategies that the expert panel members believed to be successful when addressing the topic of reduced funding for music education. In Section 2 of Survey 3, the weighted mean of the ranks were used to position the strategies for assessment purposes.

Research Question 1 Conclusions

What strategies are effective when addressing the issues of reduced funding for music education on individual communities and local businesses?

Under the umbrella of this research question were the first five questions of the survey instruments, which were used to propel thought and discussion of how to generate increased community and local support for area music programs.

Question 1 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses for increased support of music education programs. Strong consensus was reached on five strategies to increase local support: using personal contacts through networking; using shared visions to connect stakeholders and organizations; using grant opportunities offered by area businesses; using already existing Partners In Education Programs and Adopt-a School Programs; and using public performances to spur interest throughout the community. In Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel concluded that the most effective strategy in gaining increased support of music education programs with local businesses was by the use of personal contacts with local business through networking followed by a close second of using of public performances to spur interest.

Question 2 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education. Strong consensus was reached on six strategies that build awareness for music education funding issues through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using music booster clubs and parent support groups; using performances and informances to speak on the subject; using the power of media; using coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials; using stakeholder to write letters to government officials, and using opportunities to speak with local school boards. The result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument marked the most important strategy when building awareness about reduced funding for music education to be using performances and informances to speak on the subject. The second most important strategy ranked for this question was using coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials.

Question 3 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used for in building community support for music education programs. The numerical data given by the Delphi panel in Chapter 6 depicted a strong consensus for each of the six strategies listed to increase local support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using music booster clubs and parent support groups, using media, using performances, using invitations for guest artists or groups for benefit concerts, using participation in state music events/conferences/festivals, and using quality teaching for a quality product. As a result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel concurred the most important strategy for this question to be

using the power of performances throughout the community followed by using quality teaching for a quality product.

Question 4 of the survey instruments asked for strategies that can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs. As previously outlined in Chapter 6, the numerical data given by the Delphi panel indicated a strong consensus was reached on six strategies designed to increase parental support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using media, using quality public performances, using individual parent participation and booster clubs, using participation in state music events/conferences/festivals, using strong teacher leadership, and by using the power of praise with students/sharing specific information. In Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel concluded that the most effective strategy for increasing parental support was using the power of quality public performances. This strategy was closely followed by the strategy of using strong teacher leadership skills, including: approachability, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, and going the extra mile.

Question 5 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used when attempting to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support. The numerical data given by the Delphi panel as analyzed in Chapter 6 depicted a strong consensus for each of the five strategies listed to increase local support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using positive musical experiences, using media, using visibility through public performances, using opportunities to speak on advocacy, and using the influence of students' achievements on administration. As a result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel was not in total agreement on which strategy was the most

effective, which resulted in a tie for the most effective strategy, based on the 2.9 weighted rank of the mean: using the power of positive musical experiences and using the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations.

Interestingly enough, the Delphi panel, composed of both choral and instrumental teachers, higher education professors, administrators, philanthropists, funding experts, authors, and researchers with an average of over 25 years in the profession, all seemed to agree that public performances was seen as either the most important or second most important strategy with each of the questions relating to Research Questions 1 on building local community and business support for music education programs. Other top strategies included: building personal relationships within the community, having or working towards a top quality program, possessing strong leadership skills, and offering students positive musical experiences to carry with them through life.

Research Question 2 Conclusions

What strategies are effective when addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education within individual schools and school personnel?

Encompassing the body of knowledge surrounding this research question were Questions 6-9 of the survey instruments, which were used to guide thought and discussion of how to generate an increase in local school administration and personnel support of music programs.

Question 6 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education. According to the numerical data given by the Delphi panel analyzed in

Chapter 6, strong consensus was reached on the seven strategies to increase local support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using the power of persuasion through advocacy; using invitations to administrators to visit the classroom; using successful communication of upcoming events and successes; using excellence in the classroom to breed more success; using professional behavior through cooperation with other staff members; using parent groups as advocates to administration; and using the opportunity to allow administrators to be partners in decision-making. The result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument marked the most important strategy to be using excellence in the classroom to breed more success followed by using invitations to administrators to visit the classroom. The relationship between these two strategies is important. The panel obviously asserted that having excellence in the classroom was important, while at the same time, the panel concurred that, once this strategy is reached, it is necessary to show others that excellence is occurring in the classroom through personal invitations to visit. Often times, administrators do not know what is going on in classrooms because they do not obtain first-hand information. Inviting administrators to view the excellence in the classroom will not only gain administrative support, but also educate them on the benefits of music education for the students and the school.

Question 7 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used for gaining administrative support for music education. Once again, as depicted by the numerical data given by the Delphi panel analyzed in Chapter 6, strong consensus was reached on six strategies that are effective in gaining administrative support for music education through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using

opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”, using the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy, using successful communication with administrators, using professional behavior, using excellence in the classroom, and using parent groups as advocates to administration. The result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument marked the most important strategy to be using successful communication with administrators by sharing upcoming events, successes, or by asking for advice. Very closely behind this strategy was using excellence in the classroom to breed more success.

Question 8 of the survey instruments asked for strategies that can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school. As mentioned beforehand in Chapter 6, the numerical data given by the Delphi panel indicated a strong consensus was reached on four strategies designed to increase parental support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using cross-curricular conceptual and process themes, using professional development opportunities, using interdisciplinary opportunities to support basic requisites to all learning, and using collaboration with other areas in the school. As a result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel ranked the most effective strategy with this question as using cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s). The second most effective strategy outlined by the panel members was using interdisciplinary opportunities to connect learning styles through music as basic requisites to all learning.

Question 9 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas. The numerical data given by the Delphi panel as described in Chapter 6 represented a strong consensus for each of the six strategies listed to increase local support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using staff members in programs or classes, using the power of praise and advocacy, using the influence of professional attitudes, using interdisciplinary lessons and school performances, using opportunities to help staff members, and using the tradition of success from quality music programs. As a result of the ranking procedure shared in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel was in agreement that the most important strategy for this question was using interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attending other programs or events within the school. Falling closely behind in second place was using staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledging them when they do help or attend.

Looking at the list of most effective strategies for addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education within individual schools and school personnel, the diverse Delphi panel found excellence in the classroom to be an important key to winning over school personnel within specific schools. This conclusion is taken directly from the high rankings received from Question 6 and indirectly from Question 7 where successful communication involves sharing successes with administration. Another critical element in gaining support from school personnel deals with linking music with other discipline areas taken directly from the most important strategies listed in Questions 8 and 9. Furthermore, the panel concurred that in order for increased support to occur among other

professionals, cooperative educational experiences need to take place that serve to educate non-music staff members about what is actually taking place in the music room. Therefore, meaningful support stems from successful integration of the music program throughout the school building.

Research Question 3 Conclusions

What strategies are effective when addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education on local, state, and national levels?

This research question linked the last three questions of the survey instruments, Questions 10-12, together to propel thought and discussion of how to address music education funding issues on local, state, and national levels.

Question 10 of the survey instruments specifically asked for strategies that can/should be used when attempting to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs. The numerical data given by the Delphi panel as analyzed in Chapter 6 represented a strong consensus for each of the four strategies listed to increase local support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using the importance of following the instructions carefully; using the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions; using other qualified professionals to help; using the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites. As a result of the ranking procedure shared in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel found the most important strategy related to grant writing is utilizing the importance of following the instructions very carefully. It is important to note that all of the weighted means of the ranks were very close to each other suggesting

the panel did not come to a strong consensus on what the most effective strategy for grant writing is. Perhaps this is because all of the strategies must be in place to successfully complete grant applications.

Question 11 of the survey instruments asked for strategies that can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards. As mentioned previously in Chapter 6, the numerical data given by the Delphi panel analyzed indicated a strong consensus was reached on five strategies designed to increase school board support through Section 1 of the survey instrument: using the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity, using steady communication of advocacy facts, using performance opportunities at school board meetings, using invitations to board members to attend school concerts or classroom events, and by using personal contacts to proactively influence school board members. As a result of the ranking procedure outlined in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel ranked the most effective strategy within this question as using steady communication of advocacy facts. Falling narrowly behind were the, respectively listed, second and third most effective strategies of using the power of student successes through positive publicity and using invitations to board members to attend concerts and classroom events and publicly recognizing them when they do attend. The closely aligned rankings indicate some indecisiveness among the panel members when deciding which of the strategies is most effective to addressing this situation.

Question 12 of the survey instruments specifically asked for criteria that have been used to reduce funding for music education that have ultimately impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in the panel members' institutions of learning.

According to the numerical data given by the Delphi panel analyzed in Chapter 6, consensus was reached on five of the six strategies listed in Section 1 of the survey instrument: loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes, lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases, emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling, reliance on parent groups for more funding, and extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers. However, consensus was not reached on the sixth and final strategy listed under this question: Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions are taking away resources from public school arts programs. As a result of the ranking procedure shared in Section 2 of the survey instrument, the Delphi panel concluded that the most important strategy for this question was an increased emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which ultimately affects scheduling. The panel concurred that the second most important criterion to impact curricular decision-making is lower classroom budgets and reduced new instrument and music purchases. It is important to note that the panel of experts found consensus that the least likely criterion to impact curricular decision-making over the last five years is the strategy that relates Performing Arts Magnet Schools as taking away resources from public school arts programs.

The Delphi panel with diverse backgrounds all seemed to agree on the strategies relating to Research Question 3 on addressing the issue of reduced funding for music education on local, state, and national levels, but the panel did not form as strong a consensus on ranking the strategies for Research Question 3. As suggested in Chapter 6 by the comments from panel members, the panel had very little experience with grant writing, which can be attributed to the panel members' years of experience. One can

ascertain that because the panel members average years of experience was over 25 years, they were not educated on how to effectively write a grant proposal, which would make sense because 25 years ago, grants were not known as a common source for educational funding. It is no surprise that this panel, having little experience in this field, was unable to form a consensus on this issue.

It initially was a surprise that many of the panel members, who are recognized as experts in their field both regionally and nationally, did not have knowledge and experience in this method of generating additional educational funds. Similarly, the level of consensus with the ranking of strategies dealing with increasing awareness among school boards was also relatively low when comparing this with rankings from Research Questions 1 and 2. This is an important method in aiding the success of music education in our school districts, states, and ultimately with our nation. Building closer relationships with our local school board members will serve to generate support among the power figures that make both funding recommendations and curricular decisions that can either strengthen programs or place them on the cutting room floor in the months and years to come.

Finally, the lack of consensus in Question 12 displays a powerful message that should be extremely unsettling to any supporter of music education. The message of the disagreement among the panel members in how reduced funding has impacted music education curricular decision-making in the past five years simply speaks that panel members see the effects of reduced funding, but do not agree on exactly what is causing the most positive or negative effect. To further address this issue, two things must occur. The first method of addressing the issue of curricular decision-making would be to bring

together the panel members to openly discuss the pertinent funding issues in their locale. A second method of addressing this issue would be to further educate the panel on the widespread funding issues that embody the field of music education. More specific instructions related to further research immediately follow this section.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a direct result of this research study, the following recommendations are offered for consideration for future research on this topic.

Determining overall consensus on what is important to experts is the first step in addressing the problem of reduced funding for music education. Addressing the issue of how to implement the strategies found in this study is the next phase of this research. This study was strengthened by the diversity represented in the expert Delphi panel pool. The diversity mentioned above includes geographical location of the panelists, professional background, years of experience, gender, music background, educational experiences, and leadership positions within professional music organizations. Without a doubt, the diversity represented in this study speaks volumes in the consensus building that occurred in Section 1 of Survey 3. Consensus from a diverse group is important and indicates value in the findings, but in relation to Section 2 of Survey 3, where the panelists were asked to rank the strategies based on their perspective of the order of importance to the strategies, the panel's diversity impacted the findings of the rankings. Whereas in Section 1 of Survey 3 consensus building occurred from what the panel believed to be important strategies, but in Section 2 of Survey 3 relative disagreement formed among the panel members as to which strategies are the most important.

In order to come up with a more unified list of ranked strategies, break out studies of experts in different regions need to occur because how to implement the strategies to address the problem varies by locale. Once the key factor of locality of the expert panels is addressed and geographically sectioned, other variables need to be considered, such as: resources within the given geographical area, educational policies in states and districts within the given geographical area, governmental control within the given geographical area, and monies allocated to music programs and/or educational programs within the geographical area.

In further research it would also be effective to isolate and/or identify other variables that affect the opinions of the panel members, including: choral background versus instrumental background, years of experience, personality types, age, gender, and the specific profession and/or role of the panel member in his/her community. Basically, the Delphi panel in this study strongly agreed on what needs to be done to address the effects of reduced funding for music education, but the panel disagreed on which strategies were most successful when trying to effectively deal with the reduced funding situations. Isolating some of the variables listed above could be important when building lists of ranked strategies for particular groups of music educators. For example, what would work best for a shy, female, public school general music teacher in a rural town with fifteen years of teaching experience versus an outgoing, male, instrumental band director in the inner city who has only three years of experience.

There is always the argument that building a consensus on a ranked list of strategies is nearly impossible, but it still would be interesting to find out if groupings did allow for more consensus to occur within the ranking of the strategies. On the other hand,

perhaps people do not even need a ranked list of strategies to implement, but rather they just need to see strategies that could be helpful in alleviating the funding issues in their area. Then, they could determine themselves which strategies they feel most comfortable trying to implement at their own pace.

Finally, any future studies on this topic using a Delphi technique should create a survey instrument with a Likert-type scale of 1-4 instead of a 1-5 rating in order to eliminate the “3”-neutral rating. Perhaps one should even consider using a 1-4 scale with an additional ranking of “no opinion”. This would eliminate the gray area surrounding the “3”-neutral ranking being marked when the panelist really had no opinion on the subject. Creating a “no opinion” category would clarify a participant’s answers. Even though most researchers believe that Delphi panels are used to build consensus, essentially Delphi panels are used to force consensus because panelists are asked to rank items. Allowing a neutral rating does not strengthen consensus development because it grants panel members the opportunity to opt out of particular questions, which can ultimately skew the numerical data. Taking out the neutral rating would guide the experts into making clear decisions about whether or not they agreed or disagreed with a strategy. Until panel members and eventually the massive body of music educators, administrators, and political leaders (local, state, and national) can come to some sort of consensus on the place of music education within the curriculum, based on the National Standards of Music, and legislative acts, such as No Child Left Behind, and either allocate appropriate financial resources or educate educational professionals on how to find appropriate financial resources, music education and all arts education based programs will continue

to be at the top of a short list of areas to be reduced when educational funding becomes scarce.

Summary

This research study involved the study of reduced funding on music education.

The results of this study could serve as a reference guide to K-12 teachers, administrators, higher education professors, state supervisors of arts programs, authors, researchers, philanthropists, and national professional music organizations if and when music education budget reductions take center stage in their local geographical area. To proactively address the issue of reduced funding, the comprehensive list of strategies built from this expert Delphi panel could be published in a pamphlet form for mass distribution at professional development workshops, Inservice training sessions, or at state music conferences, so that additional funding measures can already be in place to keep the reduction in music programming from occurring if and when the reduction of music funding occurs. A complete listing of the strategies compiled throughout this study by the panel members is included in Appendix F.

REFERENCES

- Abeles, H. F., Hoffer, C. R., & Klotman, R. H. (1984). *Foundations of music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Benham, J. (2002, December 20). *Defending music programs with economic analysis*. Retrieved June 7, 2003, from <http://www.bcmusiccoalition.org/resources/defendmusprogreconanaly.html>
- Birge, E. B. (1966). *History of public school music in the United States*. Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.
- Boehlert, E. (1997, March 20). Class dismissed. *Rolling Stone*, 756, 22.
- Bridges, M. (2001). Life will never be the same. *The Tennessee Musician*, 54, 6, 8.
- Bunch, M. A. (1995). *Dynamics of the singing voice* (3rd ed.). Wien: Springer-Verlag.
- Bulkeley, W. (1991, November 25). Hard lessons: As schools crumble, Holyoke, Mass., voters reject tax increases-ethnic and generational splits are part of the reasons; so are distrusted officials-property owners feel burden. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A1.
- Campbell, P. S. (1994/2002). Multiculturalism and school music. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.225-226). New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, P. S. (2002). Music education in a time of cultural transformation. *Music Educators Journal* 89, 27-32.
- Chase, B. (1997). Sleeping with the enemy?. *NEA Today*, 15, 2.
- Chiodo, P. (2001). Assessing a cast of thousands. *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 17-23.
- Colwell, R. (1990/2002). Planning and evaluation: The evaluation dilemma. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.263-264). New York: Routledge.
- Clark, F. E. (2002). Music in general education. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today*. (pp.100-101) New York: Routledge.
- Clayton, M. J. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision-making tasks in education. *Educational Psychology*, 17, 373-386.

- Combs, F. M. (2000). High quality music education for every student. *The Tennessee Musician*, 53, 15-16.
- Cowden, R. L. & Klotman, R. H. (1991). *Administration and supervision of music*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Damrosch, W., Gartlan, G., & Gehrken, K. (1923/1982). The universal school music series: Part I-general directions to teachers. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Source readings in music education history* (pp. 177-178). New York: Schirmer Books.
- Davenport, J. D. (1999). The arts: A means for developing literacy. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 66, 11-15.
- Davies, M. A. (2000). Learning...the beat goes on. *Childhood Education: Infancy through Early Adolescence*, 76, 148-153.
- Delbecq, A., Van de Ven, A., & Gustafson, D. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Demorest, S. M., & Morrison, S. J. (2000). Does music make you smarter? *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 33-39.
- DeNicola, D. (2000). Listening to tomorrow's teachers. *Teaching Music*, 8, 48-52.
- Dickinson, D. (1997). Learning through the arts. *New Horizons for Learning*. Retrieved June 12, 2000, from http://www.newhorizons.org/arts_research.html.
- Dunn-Snow, P., & D'Amelio, G. (2000). How art teachers can enhance art making as a therapeutic experience: Art therapy and art education. *Art Education Journal* 53, 46-53.
- Fischer, D. M. (2002). Strike out the band. *Scholastic Scope*, 51, 22.
- Frith, S. (2003). Music and everyday life. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert, & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music: A critical introduction* (pp. 92-96). New York: Routledge.
- Gary, C. L. (1964). *Vignettes of music education history*. Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.
- Gates, J. T. (1988). *Music education in the United States: Contemporary issues*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Gewertz, C. (2001). Board sticks to teacher rebuke. *Education Week*, 20, 4.

- Goodman, A. H. (1982). *Music education perspectives and perceptions*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Grout, D. J., & Palisca, C. V. (1996). *A history of western music* (5th ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hancock, L. (1996). Why do schools flunk biology?. *Newsweek*, 127, 58-59.
- Hall, D. E. (1991). *Musical acoustics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hartnett, C. (1983). *The arts go to school: An arts-in-education handbook*. Cambridge: New England Foundation for the Arts.
- Harvey, A. (1997). An intelligence view of music education. *Music Educators National Conference*. Retrieved June 12, 2000, from <http://www.menc.org/publication/articles/academic/hawaii.htm>
- Heath, A., Neimeyer, G., & Pedersen, P. (1988). The future of cross-cultural counseling: A delphi poll. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 27-30.
- Hinckley, J. (1999/2002). Testimony to congress. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today*. (pp.299-303) New York: Routledge.
- Hinton, T. E. (2001). Legislative and public relations report. *The Tennessee Musician*, 54, 24-25.
- Hobby, J. (2002). Arts+education=core curriculum? *The Tennessee Musician*, 54, 18-19.
- Hughes, R. J. (2002, October 9). As funds fade, symphonies cut their programs. *Wall Street Journal*, p. B1.
- Jenson, E. (2000). Brain-based learning: a reality check. *Educational Leadership*, 57, 76-79.
- Jorgensen, N. S., & Pfeiler, C. (1995). *Things they never taught you in choral methods*. Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard.
- Keene, J. A. (1982). *A history of music education in the United States*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Kerman, J. (1980). *Listen* (3rd ed.). New York: Worth.
- Kennedy, M. (1984). *The Oxford dictionary of music*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Knieter, G. L. (1971). The nature of aesthetic education. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today*. (pp.177-180) New York: Routledge.
- Kronholz, J. (2002, October 10). For Florida schools, size is a big deal-A proposed amendment to shrink classes is causing problems for Gov. Jeb Bush. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A4.
- Laehman, P. R. (1993). Why your school needs music. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 94, 30-34.
- Labuta, J. A., & Smith, D. A. (1997). *Music educational historic contexts and perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lang, T. (2000). *An overview of four future methodologies*. Retrieved March 24, 2003 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.soc.hawaii.edu/future/j7/LANG.html>
- Lawler, V. (1960). Trends in music education in the United States. In E. Kraus (Ed.), *The present state of music education in the world* (pp. 177-184). Cologne, Germany: International Society for Music Education.
- Lehman, P. R. (2002). A personal perspective. *Music Educators Journal*, 88, 47-51.
- Levinowitz, L. (2001). A golden age for early childhood music education. *Teaching Music*, 9, 45-47.
- Linstone, H., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MS: Addison Wesley.
- Longley, L. (1999). Gaining the arts literacy advantage. *Educational Leadership*, 57, 71-74.
- Mark, M. (2002). *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today*. New York: Routledge.
- Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (1999). *A history of American music education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- MENC: The National Association for Music Education. (2001). *Influences on collegiate students' decision to become a music educator*. Retrieved June, 7, 2003, from <http://www.menc.org/networks/rnc/Bergee-Report.html>
- Morgan, H. B., & Burmeister, C. A. (1964). *Music research handbook*. Evanston, IL: The Instrumentalist.

- Mursell, J. L., & Glenn, M. (1938/2002). The psychology of school music teaching: The aims of school music. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.119-122). New York: Routledge.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1946/2002). A declaration of faith, purpose, and action. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.124-126). New York: Routledge.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1991). Growing up complete: The imperative for music education. Retrieved June 12, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.menc.org/publication/articles/academic/growing.htm>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002, June). *Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1999-2000*. Retrieved June 7, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002131>
- Norman, J. (1998). Listen to your soul's music. *The American Music Teacher*, 47, 57.
- Odden, A. (2001). The new school finance. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 85-91.
- Patterson, A. (2003). Music teachers and music therapists: Helping children together. *Music Educators Journal*, 89, 35-38.
- Pitts, S. (2000). *A century of change in music education: Historical perspectives on contemporary practice in British secondary school music*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.
- Poirel, A. S. (1998). The impossible course: Music in the core curriculum. *Current Musicology*, 65, 70-81.
- Ponick, F. S. (2002). Takin' care of business. *Teaching Music*, 10, 20-27.
- Potter, R. (1997). Musical intelligence: The final frontier?. *National Forum*, 77, 7-8.
- President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and Arts Education Partnership. (1999). *Gaining the arts advantage: Lessons learned from school districts that value arts education*. Retrieved June 7, 2003, from <http://www.pcah.gov>
- Rainbow, B. (1989). *Music in educational thought and practice: A survey from 800 B.C.* Aberystwyth, Wales: Boethius Press.
- Rideout, R. R. (2002). Psychology and music education since 1950. *Music Educators Journal*, 89, 33-37.
- Robinson, J. P. (1987). The arts in America. *American Demographics*, 9, 42-46.

- Royer, R. (1987). Justify your program. Retrieved June 12, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.menc.org/publication/articles/academic/royer.htm>
- Schmid, W. (1996). Music is key! *Tennessee Musician Magazine*, 49, 36-39.
- Schwadron, A. A. (1976). Of conceptions, misconceptions, and aesthetic commitment. In J. T. Gates (Ed.), *Music education in the United States: Contemporary issues* (pp. 85-88). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Steinel, D. (1988). *Arts in schools: State by state*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Sunderman, L. F. (1971). *New dimensions in music education*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.
- Swanson, B. R. (1981). *Music in the education of children*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Taylor, J. A. & Baker, R. A. (2003). E ducere: Bringing forth the best from within. *Principal Leadership*, 3, 29-32.
- Tellstrom, A. T. (1971). *Music in American education: Past and present*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Thomas, D. (2001). *Strategies to ease the negative effects of mobility on academic achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1994). *The vision for arts education in the 21st century*. Washington, DC.: Music Educators National Conference.
- Vision 2020 Symposium. (2000). The Housewright declaration. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.266-268). New York: Routledge.
- Volkman, R. (1999). Arts education today: A return to basics. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 66, 55-58.
- Warner, L. (1999). Self-esteem: A byproduct of quality classroom music. *Childhood Education: Infancy through Early Adolescence*, 76, 19-23.
- Webster, P. R. (1998). The new music educator. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 100, 2.
- Wiggins, R. A. (2001). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Music educator concerns. *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 40-44.

Winship, A. E. (1905/2002). The mission of music in the public schools. In M. L. Mark (Ed.), *Music education: Source readings from ancient Greece to today* (pp.97-99). New York: Routledge.

Zenger, W. F., & Zenger, S. K. (2002). Why teach certain material at specific grade levels?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84, 212-214.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO THE DELPHI PANEL

Hello,

It was my pleasure to spend time talking with you today. I would like to take this opportunity to tell you more about my research study and myself. As you already know, I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. Currently, I am the Choral Director at West High School in Knoxville, Tennessee. My previous teaching experience was at Vine Middle Performing Arts and Sciences Magnet School also in Knoxville.

Since the year 2000, I have been researching and studying about issues surrounding music education. Both funding and curriculum issues have been my focus. By 2002, I was privileged to have my first research study printed in the March issue of the *Tennessee Musician Magazine*. My article was entitled: *Arts + Education=Core Curriculum?*

After this article was printed, I continued to probe deeper by reviewing the test scores of the music students at Vine Middle Performing Arts and Sciences Magnet School for a two year period, which included the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 school years. As a result of this statistical study, I did see correlations between higher test scores and music education. My positive findings fueled my desire to investigate why music programs are continually in danger of being cut out of school systems all across America, which is why I need your help. I propose to use the following procedure in my research study:

Persons who have studied, worked, or been involved with music education will answer a questionnaire asking about the best strategies to address the lack of funding for music education through local, state, and national levels and return it to me. Once I have received the surveys, I will compile all of the strategies from this panel and return them for further refinement and/or additions. After the list is complete, the panel will rank the strategies on a scale of 1-5 as to their effectiveness in their professional opinion. Then, when these are returned to me, a final list of strategies will be compiled. You will receive a copy of the results from me. This information will be used not only for my dissertation, but also to help our nation's school systems find strategies to combat the lack of funding for music education.

Your help and expertise will be greatly appreciated. If you know of others who might be willing to share information, please send their names and email addresses to me. Finally, you will need to complete, sign, and return the attached Informed Consent Form (ICF) that enables you to be a Delphi panel member for this research study based on the Institutional Review Board rules and regulations.

Thank you,

Jill Hobby

APPENDIX B

ROUND 1 INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Delphi Panel Members,

Thank you for agreeing to work as a research liaison on my study in search of strategies to address the lack of funding for music education. I am honored to have a highly recognizable Delphi Panel comprised of both nationally known and internationally known music education experts with varied specialties. Membership of the panel is limited to a few highly selective experts in your field. Your participation is crucial to its success. Each year music educators must be increasingly creative in finding funding for their programs. I am extremely eager to complete the research for my dissertation, but I am also committed to finding the most accurate strategies that will help music education programs continue to be successful.

As a part of this first questionnaire, you will be asked to list strategies that you have found to be helpful in relation to questions on music education funding. Not all strategies will work in every situation, but I need for you to be complete in your answers. Feel free to make any notes that may help explain the strategies. Success stories on the strategies that have proven to be effective would be welcomed.

After the questionnaires are returned to me, I will compile a list of all strategies suggested. Your confidentiality will be protected throughout this process. No one will know which strategy you listed or the rationale behind the strategy, however if it is necessary to the research that I identify you with a specific quote, I will contact you to obtain your permission. The names of the participants will be published in the complete dissertation. At the conclusion of the study, participants will be sent an executive

summary of the findings. In order for the Delphi Survey to be successful, it is important that you list as many strategies in the first round survey as possible. This entire list will be returned to you for further refinement. When this stage is completed, I will ask you to rank the effectiveness of the strategies. My ultimate purpose is to determine the strategies that address the effects of lack of funding on music education.

Most sincerely,

Jill Hobby

Strategies to Address the Effects of Reduced Funding for Music Education
Survey Number One

Please complete these brief biographical questions:

Name:

Current Position:

College/University:

School and School System:

Instrumental or Vocal Music Background:

Profession:

Years of Professional Experience:

Past or Present Leadership Positions in Music Education Organizations:

Mailing Address:

1. Please list strategies that have been effective for **establishing partnerships with local businesses** in your area for increased support of music education programs. (Please be complete in your answers and feel free to use as much space as needed.)
2. Please list strategies that have been effective for **building awareness** about reduced funding for music education. How have people in your area been informed about the reduction in funds for music education?
3. Please list strategies that have been effective for **building community support** for music education funding.
4. Please list strategies that increase **parental support** in local music education programs.
5. Please list any ideas on how to share **music education facts and positive benefits with the public** in order to gain support.
6. Please list ways of **educating building level administrators** on the benefits of music education.
7. Please list ways of **gaining administrative support** for music education.
8. Please list ways of **inter-disciplinary learning involving music** with any other department, subject, or club in your school.

9. Please list ways of **gaining support from other teachers/professors** of other subject areas.
10. Please list successful methods for **preparing grants** to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.
11. Please list obtainable **grant sources** that support music in your area.
 - a. Local
 - b. State
 - c. Federal
 - d. Private Organizations
12. Please list strategies that increase awareness of the benefits of music education with **local school boards**.
13. Please list ways that reduced funding for music education has impacted **curricular decision-making** in the past five years in your institution.
14. Please list any other strategy that I may have missed that would aid the support of music education.

Please return this questionnaire to Jill Hobby by clicking your e-mail's 'Reply' button and then click in the field to the right of each item or question to type your response **or** you may download the survey, complete the questions, and send it back to me as an attachment via email at Hobnob2000@aol.com by **Friday, January 16, 2004**.

APPENDIX C

ROUND 2 INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Delphi Panel Members,

Thank you for your excellent responses to the first-round questionnaire. The quality of your responses provided an excellent narrative and met all of my expectations. As I explained in my earlier e-mail, this second questionnaire requires much less time. Basically, the second round is just a review of the strategies that were repeatedly suggested by each of you.

Attached to this e-mail is a list of strategies that were repeatedly suggested by the entire panel. The strategies are listed in no particular order. I have attempted to list strategies only once although many of them were listed by each of you. Your job in this second-round is merely to read through the list of strategies. If you need clarification or if you have a question, please e-mail me by January 27, 2004. On January 28, 2004, I will send the third-round survey, in which you will rank the strategies as to their effectiveness. Again, I thank you for your cooperation and willingness to serve on this panel.

Jill L. Hobby
3108 DeKalb Drive
Knoxville, TN 37920
Hobnob2000@aol.com
865-577-7968

Strategies to Address the Effects of Reduced Funding for Music Education

Round Two Survey Directions:

Read through the list of strategies. If you have questions or need clarification, please e-mail me at Hobnob2000@aol.com by January 27, 2004. Participants who have no questions shall simply wait on the final survey questionnaire (Round Three) that will be sent out January 28, 2004.

1. Please list strategies that have been effective for **establishing partnerships with local businesses** in your area for increased support of music education programs.
 - Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking
 - Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations
 - Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses
 - Utilize Partners In Education Programs/Adopt-a School Programs that are already in existence
 - Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs

2. Please list strategies that have been effective for **building awareness** about reduced funding for music education. How have people in your area been informed about the reduction in funds for music education?
 - Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups
 - Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject
 - Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
 - Utilize coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials
 - Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials
 - Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards

3. Please list strategies that have been effective for **building community support** for music education funding.
 - Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups
 - Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
 - Utilize the power of performances throughout the community

- Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts
 - Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
 - Utilize quality teaching for a quality product
4. Please list strategies that increase **parental support** in local music education programs.
- Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
 - Utilize the power of quality public performances
 - Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation
 - Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
 - Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)
 - Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information
5. Please list any ideas on how to share **music education facts and positive benefits with the public** in order to gain support.
- Utilize the power of positive musical experiences
 - Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
 - Utilize the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations
 - Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)
 - Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration
6. Please list ways of **educating building level administrators** on the benefits of music education.
- Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)
 - Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom
 - Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators
 - Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
 - Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff
 - Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

7. Please list ways of **gaining administrative support** for music education.
 - Utilize invitations to administrators to participate on programs
 - Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”
 - Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy
 - Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)
 - Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player
 - Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
 - Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration
8. Please list ways of **inter-disciplinary learning involving music** with any other department, subject, or club in your school.
 - Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics)
 - Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum
9. Please list ways of **gaining support from other teachers/professors** of other subject areas.
 - Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend
 - Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students
 - Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)
 - Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school
 - Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them
 - Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs

10. Please list successful methods for **preparing grants** to find additional funding to supplement music education programs.

- Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully
- Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions
- Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)
- Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites

11. Please list strategies that increase awareness of the benefits of music education with **local school boards**.

- Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity
- Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts
- Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings
- Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend
- Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members

12. Please list ways that reduced funding for music education has impacted **curricular decision-making** in the past five years in your institution.

- Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes
- Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases
- Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling
- Reliance on parent groups for more funding
- Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers
- Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs

(The above strategies emerged from the Round One Data. The strategies listed above received the highest number of repeated responses from the entire Delphi Panel, which indicated consensus. All of the strategies given were quality responses. To give you an idea of the amount of material I received in Round One, if I were to list each strategy received by each panel member, this e-mail would be well over twenty typed pages.)

APPENDIX D

ROUND 3 INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Delphi Panel Members,

Thank you so much for participating as a panel member for my study on music education funding. Each of you have provided such quality answers. I appreciate your time and efforts very much. The final survey is attached to this email. Please let me know soon if you are unable to open it. In order to meet the deadlines set forth by my committee, I need to have this back by February 4, 2004. This survey should take 15-20 minutes.

Thanks again,

Jill Hobby

Third Round Survey

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Please **type the number of your choice in the space beside each statement**. Select the number from the five possible choices listed below that best reflects the extent to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

- 1-Strongly disagree
- 2-Disagree
- 3-Neutral
- 4-Agree
- 5-Strongly agree

1. In your judgment, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs:

Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking___

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations___

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses___

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

Utilize Partners In Education Programs that are already in existence___

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs___

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

2. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education:

Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize coalitions with parents, teachers, and local higher education officials___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

3. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding:

Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of performances throughout the community___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Utilize quality teaching for a quality product ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs:

Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of quality public performances ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile) ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information ___				
1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support:

Utilize the power of positive musical experiences____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of visibility through public performances/demonstrations____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

6. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education:

Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

7. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education:

Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

8. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school:

Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)_____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development_____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning_____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy)_____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

9. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas:

Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend_____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

10. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs:

Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)____

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites____

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

11. In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards:

Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

12. In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education that have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution:

Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling___

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Reliance on parent groups for more funding___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs___

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

SECTION 2

EVALUATION OF PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

For each of the statements below rank the priority order **in the space to the left of the statement. Place a #1 in the blank of the most important statement**, a #2 in the blank of the second most important statement and likewise continue until you have ranked each item for each statement.

1. In your opinion, the following strategies can/should be used for establishing partnerships with local businesses in your area for increased support of music education programs:

___ Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking

___ Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations

___ Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses

___ Utilize Partners In Education Programs/Adopt-a School Programs that are already in existence

___ Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs

2. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used for building awareness about reduced funding for music education:

___ Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups

___ Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject

___ Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

___ Utilize coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials

___ Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials

___ Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards

3. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in building community support for music education funding:

___ Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups

___ Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written

- Utilize the power of performances throughout the community
- Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts
- Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
- Utilize quality teaching for a quality product

4. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when trying to increase parental support in local music education programs:

- Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
- Utilize the power of quality public performances
- Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation
- Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
- Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)
- Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information

5. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to share music education facts and positive benefits with the public in order to gain support:

- Utilize the power of positive musical experiences
- Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
- Utilize the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations
- Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)
- Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration

6. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used when educating building level administrators on the benefits of music education:

- Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)
- Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom

- Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators
- Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
- Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff
- Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration
- Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making

7. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used in gaining administrative support for music education:

- Utilize invitations to administrators to participate on programs
- Utilize opportunities to participate in the “total school picture”
- Utilize the value of music education on the overall education of the student through advocacy
- Utilize successful communication with administrators (upcoming events, successes, or asking advice)
- Utilize professional behavior by cooperating as a team player
- Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
- Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration

8. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used with interdisciplinary learning involving music with any other department, subject, or club in your school:

- Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)
- Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development

___ Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning

___ Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy)

9. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain support from other teachers/professors of other subject areas:

___ Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend

___ Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students

___ Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)

___ Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school

___ Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them

___ Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs

10. In your opinion, the following criteria can/should be used to gain successful methods for preparing grants to find additional funding to supplement music education programs:

___ Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully

___ Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions

___ Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)

___ Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites

11. In your opinion, the following important criteria can/should be used to increase awareness of the benefits of music education with local school boards:

___ Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity

Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts

Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings

Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend

Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members

12. In your opinion, the following criteria have been used to reduce funding for music education that have impacted curricular decision-making in the past five years in your institution:

Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes

Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases

Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling

Reliance on parent groups for more funding

Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers

Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs

Thank you for participating as a Delphi Panel Member in my dissertation. I look forward to completing the tabulations of your results. As soon as I am finished with the results, I will send each of you a copy. It has been my privilege to be able to read through and analyze the comments from such highly qualified individuals. I will be in contact very soon.

Please send the completed Survey Three back to my e-mail address (Hobnob2000@aol.com) by **February 4, 2004**. It is very important that you adhere to this deadline for tabulation purposes.

APPENDIX E

THE DELPHI PANEL

Melissa Arasi, Coordinator of General and Choral Music
Cobb County School District
Southern Division ACDA Women's Repertoire and Standards Chair
1416 Grovehurst Drive
Marietta, GA 30062

Jackie Ball, Chair of Univ. of Tennessee School of Music Advisory Board, Vice
President of Education for Knoxville Opera Guild
110 Berwick Drive
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Dr. Angela Batey, Tennessee American Choral Directors Association President,
Associate Director, School of Music
University of Tennessee
School of Music
211 Music Building
Knoxville, TN. 37996

Margaret Campbelle-Holman, McGraw-Hill Publishers Author and Consultant
Artistic Director and Conductor, The MET Singers Honor Choir
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools
Middle Tennessee Elementary Music Educators President
4200 Kings Court
Nashville, TN 37218

Ron Chronister, General and Choral Music Teacher, Kansas Music Educators
Association Past President, Tri-M Chair, MENC South Western Division President-Elect
Halstead Middle and High Schools
320 West Street
Halstead, KS 67056

Dr. Jeanette Crosswhite, Director of Arts Education for Tennessee
Andrew Johnson Tower-Fifth Floor
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

Dr. John Culvahouse, Director of Bands, Associate Professor of Music
University of Georgia
250 River Road
Athens, GA 30602

Steve Damron, Instrumental Teacher and Author
Northfield Mount Hermon School
475 Main Road
Gill, MA 01376

Don Doyle, California Department of Education Visual and Performing Arts Consultant
Past President California Music Educators Association, Facilitator for California Arts
Assessment Network, Board Member California Alliance for Arts Education
California Department of Education
Visual and Performing Arts Office
1430 North Street, Suite 4309
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dr. Lynda Dunn, Associate Professor of Music Education
Carson-Newman College
CNC Box 71967
Jefferson City, TN 37760

Claudia Grayson, Elementary Music Teacher and Orff Specialist
Sycamore Schools District (Cincinnati, OH)
P. O. Box 1495
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Janet Gross, Elementary Instrumental Music Teacher
Calvert County Public Schools (Prince Frederick, MD)
1447 Bidwell Lane
Huntingtown, MD 20639

Mark Guyer, Grants/Fundraising Coordinator Stark County District Library, Author
715 Market Ave. N.
Canton, OH 44702

Dr. Alan Henderson, Associate Professor of Music, Former Music Department Chair
Austin Peay State University
723 North Second Street
Clarksville, TN

Connie Hodge McCain, Choral Director
Antioch High School, Metro Nashville School System
8014 Hobson Pike
Smyrna, TN 37167

Ken Jarnigan, Principal and Former Band and Orchestra Director
Maryville High School
825 Lawrence Avenue
Maryville, TN 37803

Elizabeth Forrest Jennings, Music Specialist
Chesterfield County Public Schools in Virginia
5301 Chestnut Bluff Place
Midlothian, VA 23112

Judith Kirby, Retired Elementary Vocal Music Teacher, Orff Specialist, District Chair of
Illinois Music Educators Association
Western Avenue School in Flossmoor, Illinois District 161
10676 Brookridge Drive
Frankfort, IL 60423

Garland Markham, Supervisor of Music
Cobb County School System
514 Glover Street
Marietta, GA 30060

Dr. Russell Mays, Elementary School Principal, Instrumental Musician
Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership
University of North Florida
12402 Good Neighbor Trail
Jacksonville, FL 32225-4590

Nancy Meyette, Elementary Music Educator General
Fitzgerald Public Schools System, Michigan Federation of Music Clubs State Chairman
for Junior Composers
69435 Brookhill Drive
Romeo, MI 48065

Karen Mueller, Elementary Music Specialist K-5, Smyrna Elementary
Rutherford County Schools, MTAOSA President
627 Georgetown Drive
Nashville, TN 37205

Dr. Julia Price, Principal, Hamblen County Schools and Adjunct Professor, Carson-
Newman College, East Tennessee State University, and Tusculum College
5620 Old Highway 11-E
Morristown, TN 37814

Tony Pietricola, Instrumental Music Teacher
Charlotte Central School, Vermont Music Educators' Association State Manager
6 Old Town Lane
Grand Isle, VT 05458

Dr. Jonny Ramsey, Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity President
514 Mack Drive
Denton, TX 76209

Sue Rarus, Director of Research, Music Educators National Conference
1806 Robert Fulton Drive
Reston, VA 20191

Laura Ritter, Associate Professor of Music and Director of Choral Music
Walters State Community College
500 S. Davy Crockett Parkway
Morristown, TN 37813

Gregory Roach, Assistant Principal and Former Band Director
West High School, Knox County Schools
3300 Sutherland Avenue
Knoxville, TN. 37919

Dr. David Roe, Retired Instrumental and Vocal Music Teacher, Composer, Publisher
Toronto District School Board
97 Batson Drive
Aurora, Ontario, Canada L4G 3R2

Richard Rogers, Band Director
West High School, Knox County Schools
3300 Sutherland Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37919

David Royse, Coordinator and Associate Professor of Music Education
University of Tennessee
School of Music
211 Music Building
Knoxville, TN. 37996

Sue Snyder, President of Arts Education IDEAS, Entrepreneur, Consultant, Author,
Scholar-in-Residence–CT State Department of Education BEST Program, Board of
Directors-MACH (Music and Arts Center for Humanity)
5 Lancaster Drive
Norwalk, CT 06850

Moe Turrentine, Retired Instrumental Teacher, Coordinator of Fine Arts in Fairfax
County, State Manager of Virginia Music Educators Association
Virginia County Public Schools
398 Snowbird Lane
Swanton, MD 21561

Dr. Kay Wideman, Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity Foundation President
and Cobb County, Georgia Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction
503 Greystone Lane
Douglasville, GA 30134

Michelle Worthing, Retired Instrumental Teacher
East Woods School, Hudson City Schools (Ohio)
3568 Dayton Avenue
Kent, OH 44240

APPENDIX F

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS THE EFFECTS OF REDUCED FUNDING FOR MUSIC EDUCATION*

- Utilize personal contacts with local businesses through networking
- Utilize the power of shared visions between stakeholders/organizations
- Utilize grant opportunities offered by local businesses
- Utilize Partners In Education Programs/Adopt-a School Programs that are already in existence
- Utilize public performances to spur interest in the school programs
- Utilize music booster clubs and parent support groups
- Utilize performances and informances to speak on the subject
- Utilize the power of media-both spoken and written
- Utilize coalitions between parents, teachers, and local higher education officials
- Utilize stakeholders to write letters to government officials
- Utilize opportunities to speak with local school boards
- Utilize the power of performances throughout the community
- Utilize invitations for guest artists or groups for school benefit concerts
- Utilize participation in state music events/conferences/festivals
- Utilize quality teaching for a quality product
- Utilize the power of quality public performances
- Utilize individual parent participation and booster club participation
- Utilize strong teacher leadership (approachable, caring, even-tempered, honest, fair, personable, going the extra mile)
- Utilize the power of praise with students/sharing specific information
- Utilize the power of positive musical experiences
- Utilize the power of visibility through public performances and demonstrations
- Utilize the opportunities to speak on advocacy throughout the community (performances, forums, local community service groups)
- Utilize the influence of students' achievements on administration
- Utilize the power of persuasion through advocacy (aesthetic qualities and comparison of test scores)
- Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom
- Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators
- Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
- Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff
- Utilize parent groups as advocates to administration
- Utilize invitations to administrators to visit the classroom
- Utilize successful communication of upcoming events and successes with administrators
- Utilize excellence in the classroom to breed more success
- Utilize professional behavior by cooperating with all members of the staff

- Utilize the opportunity to allow administrators to be a partner in decision-making
- Utilize cross-curricular conceptual and process themes that lead to generalization and allow music concepts and skills to be taught with integrity within the context of the integrated unit(s)
- Utilize professional development opportunities to educate staff members on the importance of integrating the curriculum, to provide research and theory that support integration, to identify levels of integration, to identify the needs and challenges of real change, and to provide a scaffolding for teacher teams to work together through modeling, risk-taking, and curriculum development
- Utilize interdisciplinary opportunities to share the importance of building music understanding skills, and the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, as basic requisites to all learning
- Utilize collaboration with all grade levels, teams, or departments to integrate music with all areas of instruction (history, art, physical education, English, drama, computer, math, humanities, science, ROTC, foreign language, clubs, family and consumer science, ESL, community projects, special education, athletics, literacy)
- Utilize staff members in programs or classes and publicly acknowledge them when they do help or attend
- Utilize the power of praise and advocacy to help students
- Utilize the influence of professional attitudes (flexibility, listening, cooperating, being an equal)
- Utilizing interdisciplinary lessons and school performances throughout the school building or attend other programs or events within the school
- Utilize opportunities to help staff members or offer materials to assist them
- Utilize the tradition of success from quality music programs
- Utilize the importance of following the instructions very carefully
- Utilize the ability to address specific items outlined in the directions
- Utilize other qualified professionals that can help (parents, fellow teachers, district grant specialist, teams of teachers)
- Utilize the importance of taking time to research grants through books, articles, and websites
- Utilize the power of sharing student successes through positive publicity
- Utilize steady communication of advocacy facts
- Utilize performance opportunities at school board meetings
- Utilize invitations to school boards to attend school concerts and classroom events/publicly recognize them when they do attend
- Utilize personal contacts to proactively influence school board members
- Loss of teachers/smaller numbers of classes
- Lower classroom budgets/reduced new instrument and music purchases
- Emphasis on test scores in academic areas, which affects scheduling
- Reliance on parent groups for more funding
- Extended educational opportunities/professional development is at the expense of teachers

- Performing Arts Magnet Schools and School for the Arts Institutions taking away resources from public school arts programs

*Strategies were only listed one time in this location even though the panel members listed several strategies more than once.

